arXiv:1704.01024v1 [math.GN] 4 Apr 2017

DISTANCE DOMAINS

TRISTAN BICE

Abstract. We explore extensions of domain theoretic concepts, like completeness and continuity, replacing order relations with non-symmetric distances.

Motivation

A number of works have extended domain theory – see (Gierz et al. 2003) – from posets to more metric-like structures. However, both the classical theory and these generalizations tend to focus on just one aspect of the dual nature of domains. Our primary goal is explore the other aspect.

More precisely, the standard approach to domain theory is to start with a partial order $\leq$ and then define its way-below relation $\ll$, a transitive but generally non-reflexive relation. An alternative approach is to start with a transitive relation $\ll$ and then define its reflexivization $\leq$. Using maxima rather than suprema, one also obtains dual notions of completeness and continuity for $\ll$. This is the approach we seek to generalize, working with general non-symmetric distances $\mathbf{d}$ and their hemimetric reflexivizations $\underline{\mathbf{d}}$.

Also, previous works have developed quantitative domain theory in a highly category or fuzzy theoretic way – see e.g. (Hofmann and Waszkiewicz 2011) and (Rao and Li 2013). Another goal of our paper is to provide a more classic approach through topology, metric and order theory, building on (Goubault-Larrecq 2013). This has the advantage of leading to certain natural generalizations and should also be more accessible to analysts.

In particular, we have two examples in mind from non-commutative topology. First, consider the hereditary C*-subalgebras $\mathcal{H}(A)$ of a C*-algebra A, ordered by inclusion $\subseteq$. When A is commutative, these correspond to the open subsets of a locally compact Hausdorff topological space, a well-known example of a classical domain. However, $\mathcal{H}(A)$ may fail to be a domain in general, even for basic non-commutative C*-algebras like $C([0,1], M_2)$(=continuous functions from the unit interval to two by two complex matrices). The key observation here is that $\mathcal{H}(A)$ does, however, always form a distance domain when we replace the inclusion ordering $\subseteq$ with the Hausdorff distance $\underline{\mathbf{d}}$ on the positive unit balls B^1_+ of $B \in \mathcal{H}(A)$,

$$\underline{\mathbf{d}}(B,C) = \sup_{b\in B^1_+} \inf_{c\in C^1_+} ||b-bc||.$$

Moreover, the way-below distance $\mathbf{d}$ comes from the reverse Hausdorff distance

$$\mathbf{d}(B,C) = \inf_{c\in C^1_+} \sup_{b\in B^1_+} ||b-bc||.$$

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 06A06, 18A35, 54E50, 54E55.

Key words and phrases. domain, distance, hemimetric, quasimetric, order, topology, complete.

This research has been supported by IMPAN (Poland).

There can also be merit in quantifying classical domains, e.g. consider the lower semicontinuous [0,1]-valued functions $LSC(X,[0,1])$ on some compact Hausdorff X with the pointwise ordering $\leq$. This is another well-known example of a classical domain – see (Gierz et al. 2003, Example I-1.22). But when we replace $\leq$ with

$$\underline{\mathbf{d}}(f,g) = \sup_{x\in X}(f(x)-g(x))_+,$$

we get an even nicer structure. Specifically $LSC(X,[0,1])$ becomes an *algebraic* domain, in an appropriate quantitative sense, where the finite/compact elements – see (Goubault-Larrecq 2013, Definition 7.4.56) – are precisely the continuous functions $C(X,[0,1])$ (by a slight generalization of Dini's theorem). Moreover, this extends to the lower semicontinuous elements of A_+^{**1} for a much larger class of ordered Banach spaces A – see (Bice 2016).

Apart from the inherent interest in generalization, we feel examples like this justify the study of distance domains. So from now on we put functional analysis to one side to develop a general domain theory for non-symmetric distances.

Outline

While category theory is not our focus, we do consider one very elementary category **GRel** of generalized relations. Indeed, throughout we make use of various interpolation assumptions and characterizations which are concisely described by composition $\circ$ in **GRel**. In §1, we describe the basic properties of **GRel** and set out much of the notation used throughout. Note our functions take values in $[0,\infty]$, rather than the more general quantales often considered elsewhere. This is primarily to reduce the notational burden, which is already quite heavy due to the various topologies, relations and operations we need to consider. In any case, $[0,\infty]$ valued functions are perfectly suited to the analytic examples we have in mind.

As mentioned above, one of our primary goals is to generalize previous work on hemimetrics to distances, functions merely satisfying the triangle inequality. This is crucial because we want to develop a dual theory of distance domains starting from distance analogs of the way-below relation. In §2 we discuss distances $\mathbf{d}$ and their hemimetric reflexivizations $\overline{\mathbf{d}}$ and $\underline{\mathbf{d}}$ in Proposition 2.2. Following that, we give some simple examples on $[0,1]$ and $[0,\infty]$.

Next, in §3, we discuss two natural generalizations of Cauchy nets. Note here, as elsewhere, basic properties of hemimetrics can often be extended to distances and even more general functions by replacing $\mathbf{d}$ with $\overline{\mathbf{d}}$ and $\underline{\mathbf{d}}$ where appropriate.

We also aim to develop the theory in a more topological way. The key to this is to consider topologies generated by open holes as well as open balls. In §4 we characterize convergence in various combinations of ball and hole topologies.

Yet another one of our goals is to explore the connection between topological and relational generalizations of metric and order theoretic concepts.

Figure 1. Metric vs Order Analogs

Topological	Relational
Nets	Subsets
$\mathbf{d}$-Cauchy	$\mathbf{d}$-directed
$\mathbf{d}^{\circ}_{\circ}$-limit	$\mathbf{d}$-supremum
$\mathbf{d}^{\bullet}_{\circ}$-limit	$\mathbf{d}$-maximum

As with hole topologies, we feel the relational notions have not received the attention they deserve. Even apart from their intrinsic interest, these relational notions can serve as a useful intermediary between classical order theoretic concepts and their topological generalizations. So in §5 we start off by defining **d**-directed subsets and investigating their relation to **d**-Cauchy nets.

Suprema are usually considered the poset analog of limits. However maxima, in an appropriate sense, can be better suited to non-reflexive transitive relations. In §6 we extend these concepts to distances **d** and examine their relationship to suprema and maxima relative to $\leq^{\mathbf{d}}$ and $<^{\mathbf{d}}$.

In §7, we define topological and relational notions of completeness and explain how they generalize standard notions of Yoneda, Smyth, metric and directed completeness. We then show how to turn **d**-Cauchy nets into **d**-directed subsets under several interpolation conditions. These allow $\mathbf{d}^\bullet_\circ$-completeness(=Smyth completeness for hemimetric **d**) to be derived from **d**-max-completeness in Corollary 7.7, complementing the Yoneda completeness characterizations in (Bice 2017). Note, to avoid repeating our basic hypotheses, we make the blanket assumption immediately after Proposition 7.2 that **d** and **e** are distances on X.

Several generalizations of continuity (in the order theoretic sense) have been considered in the literature. Our approach in §8 is to simply switch the quantifiers in completeness. We then show in Theorem 8.3 and Theorem 8.4 how $\mathbf{d}^\bullet_\circ$-continuity and **d**-max-continuity can be characterized by interpolation conditions generalizing abstract bases.

Next we introduce distance analogs of the way-below relation in §9. After discussing their basic properties, we give dual characterizations of distance domains in Theorem 9.3 and Theorem 9.5. This allows us to largely bypass the way-below construction and return to focus on reflexivizations. This duality may also be of some interest even in the classical case. Indeed, domains are usually defined as certain kinds of posets, but here we see that domains can alternatively be defined as certain kinds of abstract bases.

To complete **d**-max-predomains to **d**-max-domains, we introduce Hausdorff distances in §10, paying particular attention to the reverse Hausdorff distance and its relation to the usual Hausdorff distance. The completion is then obtained in Theorem 10.5, and its universality is proved in Theorem 10.7. In Corollary 10.6 we show that **d**-max-predomains are precisely the **d**-max-bases of **d**-max-domains.

In order to extend this completion from the relational to the topological setting, we introduce formal balls X_+ in §11. As a precursor we show in Theorem 11.6 that $\mathbf{d}^\bullet_\circ$-completeness and $\mathbf{d}^\bullet_\circ$-continuity in X are equivalent to their order theoretic counterparts in X_+. This yields a dual formulation of a theorem of Kostanek-Waszkiewicz – see Corollary 11.7 – which in this form generalizes the Romaguera-Valero theorem – see Corollary 11.8. Lastly, we discuss how the $\mathbf{d}^\bullet_\circ$-domain completion of a $\mathbf{d}^\bullet_\circ$-predomain generalizes the Yoneda and Smyth completion of a hemimetric space – see Theorem 11.12.

1. Generalized Relations

The traditional category theoretic approach to quasimetric spaces is to take each quasimetric as its own category, with the elements of the space as objects and the values of the quasimetric as morphisms, as in (Lawvere 2002). Alternatively, quasimetric spaces are sometimes considered as the objects of a category with Lipschitz

maps as morphisms, as in (Goubault-Larrecq 2013, Defintion 6.2.13). However, the constructions we consider are best described in a category with quasimetrics, and even more general binary functions, as the morphisms instead. This is like the category of modules considered in (Hofmann and Waszkiewicz 2012, §2.3), except that our objects are just sets, without any distinguished hemimetric structure.

Specifically, we consider any $\mathbf{d} \in [0,\infty]^{X\times Y}$ (= functions from $X \times Y$ to $[0,\infty]$) as a *generalized relation* from the set X to the set Y. We extend the standard infix notation for classical relations to generalized relations and define

$$x\mathbf{d}y = \mathbf{d}(x,y).$$

Just like the category **Rel** of classical relations, generalized relations form the morphisms of a category **GRel** when we define the composition $\mathbf{d}\circ\mathbf{e} \in [0,\infty]^{X\times Y}$ of $\mathbf{d} \in [0,\infty]^{X\times Z}$ and $\mathbf{e} \in [0,\infty]^{Z\times Y}$ by

$$x(\mathbf{d}\circ\mathbf{e})y = \inf_{z\in Z}(x\mathbf{d}z + z\mathbf{e}y).$$

In fact, **Rel** becomes a wide subcategory of **GRel** when we identify each relation $\sqsubset \subseteq X \times Y$ with its characteristic function (as we do consistently from now on):

$$\sqsubset(x,y) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } x \sqsubset y \\ \infty & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Moreover, the inclusion from **Rel** to **GRel** has a left inverse $\mathbf{d} \mapsto \leq^{\mathbf{d}}$ where

$$x \leq^{\mathbf{d}} y \qquad \Leftrightarrow \qquad x\mathbf{d}y = 0,$$

i.e. $\leq^{\mathbf{d}}$ is the relation identified with $\infty\mathbf{d}$, where $\infty 0 = 0$ and $\infty r = \infty$, for $r > 0$. Note $\mathbf{d} \mapsto \leq^{\mathbf{d}}$ is also functorial in that

$$\leq^{\mathbf{d}} \circ \leq^{\mathbf{e}} \quad \subseteq \quad \leq^{\mathbf{d}\circ\mathbf{e}}.$$

Various properties of **Rel** also extend to **GRel**. For example, **GRel** is a dagger category with involution $\mathbf{d}^{\mathrm{op}}$ defined by

$$x\mathbf{d}^{\mathrm{op}}y = y\mathbf{d}x.$$

Also, **GRel** is a 2-category, namely a 2-poset, with the order defined pointwise

$$\mathbf{d} \leq \mathbf{e} \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \forall x \in X\, \forall y \in Y\ x\mathbf{d}y \leq x\mathbf{e}y,$$

which is compatible with both $\circ$ and $^{\mathrm{op}}$. Each hom-set $[0,\infty]^{X\times Y}$ is also a complete lattice with minimum $\mathbf{0}$ and maximum $\boldsymbol{\infty}$ where, for $x \in X$, $y \in Y$ and $r \in [0,\infty]$,

$$x\mathbf{r}y = r.$$

In particular, we have 'intersections' $\mathbf{d} \vee \mathbf{e}$, from which we define symmetrizations

$$\mathbf{d}^{\vee} = \mathbf{d} \vee \mathbf{d}^{\mathrm{op}},$$

when $X = Y$. In fact, the only thing stopping **GRel** from being an allegory – see (Freyd and Scedrov 1990) – is the modularity requirement.

However, as in division allegories, we do have Kan extensions/lifts. Specifically, for $\mathbf{d} \in [0,\infty]^{X\times Z}$ and $\mathbf{e} \in [0,\infty]^{Y\times Z}$, define $\mathbf{d}/\mathbf{e} \in [0,\infty]^{X\times Y}$ by

$$x(\mathbf{d}/\mathbf{e})y = \sup_{z\in Z}(x\mathbf{d}z - y\mathbf{e}z)_+,$$

where we define $r_+ = r \vee 0$, for all $r \in [0,\infty]$, and take $\infty - \infty = 0$. Likewise, for $\mathbf{d} \in [0,\infty]^{Z\times Y}$ and $\mathbf{e} \in [0,\infty]^{Z\times X}$, define $\mathbf{e}\backslash\mathbf{d} \in [0,\infty]^{X\times Y}$ by

$$x(\mathbf{e}\backslash\mathbf{d})y = \sup_{z\in Z}(z\mathbf{d}y - z\mathbf{e}x)_+.$$

Then for $\mathbf{d} \in [0,\infty]^{X\times Z}$, $\mathbf{e} \in [0,\infty]^{Z\times Y}$ and $\mathbf{f} \in [0,\infty]^{X\times Y}$,

$$\begin{array}{lllll} x\mathbf{f}y - z\mathbf{e}y \le x\mathbf{d}z & \Leftrightarrow & x\mathbf{f}y \le x\mathbf{d}z + z\mathbf{e}y & \Leftrightarrow & x\mathbf{f}y - x\mathbf{d}z \le z\mathbf{e}y, \\ \text{so} \quad \mathbf{f}/\mathbf{e} \le \mathbf{d} & \Leftrightarrow & \mathbf{f} \le \mathbf{d}\circ\mathbf{e} & \Leftrightarrow & \mathbf{d}\backslash\mathbf{f} \le \mathbf{e}. \end{array}$$

We can also view **GRel** as a 2-proset with respect to a much weaker preorder $\precsim$. First, we introduce some more notation. For $x \in X$, $y \in Y$ and $\mathbf{d} \in [0,\infty]^{X\times Y}$, define $x\mathbf{d} \in [0,\infty]^Y$ and $\mathbf{d}y \in [0,\infty]^X$ by

$$x\mathbf{d}(y) = x\mathbf{d}y = \mathbf{d}y(x).$$

Again we identify subsets with their characteristic functions so, for any $\sqsubset \subseteq X\times Y$,

$$\begin{array}{rcl} x\sqsubset & = & \{y \in X : x \sqsubset y\}. \\ \sqsubset x & = & \{y \in X : y \sqsubset x\}. \end{array}$$

Also, for any $\mathbf{f} \in X^{\mathbb{R}}$, any relation $\sqsubset \subseteq [0,\infty]\times[0,\infty]$ and any $r \in [0,\infty]$, define

$$\sqsubset^{\mathbf{f}}_r = \{x \in X : \mathbf{f}(x) \sqsubset r\}.$$

For the strict ordering $<$ on $[0,\infty]$ and inclusion $\subseteq$ on $\mathcal{P}(X) = \{Y : Y \subseteq X\}$, define

$$\Phi^{\mathbf{f}} = \bigcup_{\epsilon>0}(<^{\mathbf{f}}_\epsilon \subseteq) = \{\sqsubset \subseteq X : \exists\epsilon > 0\ (<^{\mathbf{f}}_\epsilon \subseteq \sqsubset)\}.$$

Now define the uniform preorder $\precsim$ and equivalence $\approx$ on $[0,\infty]^X$ by

$$\begin{array}{lll} \mathbf{f} \precsim \mathbf{g} & \Leftrightarrow & \Phi^{\mathbf{f}} \subseteq \Phi^{\mathbf{g}}. \\ \mathbf{f} \approx \mathbf{g} & \Leftrightarrow & \Phi^{\mathbf{f}} = \Phi^{\mathbf{g}}. \end{array}$$

Equivalently, define $\mathbf{f} \precsim \mathbf{g}$ as $\lim_{r\to 0} \frac{\mathbf{f}}{\mathbf{g}}(r) = 0$, where $\frac{\mathbf{f}}{\mathbf{g}} \in [0,\infty]^{[0,\infty]}$ is given by

$$\tfrac{\mathbf{f}}{\mathbf{g}}(r) = \sup_{\mathbf{g}(x)\le r} \mathbf{f}(x).$$

Then we always have $\mathbf{f}(x) \le \frac{\mathbf{f}}{\mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{g}(x))$ and, for the identity map $\mathbf{I} \in [0,\infty]^{[0,\infty]}$,

$$\begin{array}{lll} \mathbf{f} \le \mathbf{g} & \Leftrightarrow & \frac{\mathbf{f}}{\mathbf{g}} \le \mathbf{I}. \\ \mathbf{f} \precsim \mathbf{g} & \Leftrightarrow & \frac{\mathbf{f}}{\mathbf{g}} \precsim \mathbf{I}. \end{array}$$

Note these definitions extend some standard metric space notions. Specifically, if $\mathbf{d},\mathbf{e} \in [0,\infty]^{X\times X}$ are metrics then $\Phi^{\mathbf{d}}$ is the usual uniformity defined from $\mathbf{d}$ and $\mathbf{d} \approx \mathbf{e}$ iff $\mathbf{d}$ and $\mathbf{e}$ are uniformly equivalent in the usual sense. Also note that, for any $\mathbf{d} \in [0,\infty]^{X\times Y}$, we have $\le^{\mathbf{d}} = \le^{\mathbf{d}}_0 = \bigcap \Phi^{\mathbf{d}}$. We also extend composition to $\Phi^{\mathbf{d}}$ by taking appropriate suprema or infima, e.g.

$$\mathbf{e}\circ\Phi^{\mathbf{d}} = \sup_{\sqsubset\in\Phi^{\mathbf{d}}}(\mathbf{e}\circ\sqsubset) = \sup_{\epsilon>0}(\mathbf{e}\circ<^{\mathbf{d}}_\epsilon) = \sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}}(\mathbf{e}\circ n\mathbf{d}) \le \mathbf{e}\circ\le^{\mathbf{d}}.$$

Let us also define some functors on comma categories of **GRel** that we will need later on. Specifically, define $\mathcal{P}\mathbf{d} \in [0,\infty]^{\mathcal{P}(X)\times Y}$ and $\mathbf{d}\mathcal{P} \in [0,\infty]^{X\times\mathcal{P}(Y)}$ by

$$\mathcal{P}\mathbf{d}(Z,y) = \sup_{z\in Z} z\mathbf{d}y.$$
$$\mathbf{d}\mathcal{P}(x,Z) = \sup_{z\in Z} x\mathbf{d}z.$$

Let $\mathcal{F}(X)$ denote the finite subsets of X, i.e. with $|F|=$ cardinality of F,

$$\mathcal{F}(X) = \{F\subseteq X : |F|<\infty\}.$$

Let $\mathcal{F}\mathbf{d} \in [0,\infty]^{\mathcal{F}(X)\times Y}$ and $\mathbf{d}\mathcal{F} \in [0,\infty]^{X\times\mathcal{F}(Y)}$ be the restrictions of $\mathcal{P}\mathbf{d}$ and $\mathbf{d}\mathcal{P}$. Note we include $\emptyset$ in $\mathcal{P}(X)$ and $\mathcal{F}(X)$ and take $\sup\emptyset = 0$ (and $\inf\emptyset=\infty$).

It will also be convenient to extend our earlier notation to subsets. Specifically, for $V\subseteq X$, $W\subseteq Y$ and $\mathbf{d}\in[0,\infty]^{X\times Y}$, define $V\mathbf{d}\in[0,\infty]^Y$ and $\mathbf{d}W\in[0,\infty]^X$ by

$$V\mathbf{d} = \sup_{v\in V} v\mathbf{d} (= V\mathcal{P}\mathbf{d}).$$
$$\mathbf{d}W = \inf_{w\in W} \mathbf{d}w.$$

Let us also extend this to unary functions $\mathbf{f}\in[0,\infty]^X$ so, for $V\subseteq X$,

$$V\mathbf{f} = \sup_{v\in V}\mathbf{f}(v).$$
$$\mathbf{f}V = \inf_{v\in V}\mathbf{f}(v).$$

Combining this with the above notation, we can write expressions like

$$V\mathbf{d}y = V(\mathbf{d}y) = (V\mathbf{d})(y) = \sup_{v\in V} v\mathbf{d}y.$$
$$WV\mathbf{d} = W(V\mathbf{d}) = \sup_{w\in W}\sup_{v\in V} v\mathbf{d}w.$$

We also consider nets $\mathsf{N}(X)$ in X in a slightly more general sense than usual. Specifically, as we deal with non-hemimetric distances (see below), we must also deal with non-reflexive nets (to allow for $\mathbf{d}$-Cauchy nets even when $\leq^{\mathbf{d}}$ is not reflexive). So by a net we mean a set indexed by a directed set Λ, i.e. we have (possibly non-reflexive) transitive $\prec\subseteq\Lambda\times\Lambda$ satisfying $\forall\gamma,\delta\ \exists\lambda\ (\gamma,\delta\prec\lambda)$. Define limits by

$$x_\lambda\to x \quad\Leftrightarrow\quad \forall \text{ open } O\ni x\ \exists\gamma\in\Lambda\ (x_\lambda)_{\gamma\succ\lambda}\subseteq O$$

as usual (in fact, these are the same as limits with respect to the preorder $\preceq$ defined from $\prec$ as in the next section). Limits in $[0,\infty]$ are considered with respect to the usual interval topology and limits inferior and superior are defined as usual by

$$\liminf_\lambda r_\lambda = \lim_\gamma \inf_{\gamma\prec\lambda} r_\lambda.$$
$$\limsup_\lambda r_\lambda = \lim_\gamma \sup_{\gamma\prec\lambda} r_\lambda.$$

These replace infima and suprema in the notation above, i.e. for $(x_\lambda)\subseteq X$, $(y_\gamma)\subseteq Y$ and $\mathbf{d}\in[0,\infty]^{X\times Y}$, we define $(x_\lambda)\mathbf{d}\in[0,\infty]^Y$ and $\mathbf{d}(y_\gamma)\in[0,\infty]^X$ by

$$(x_\lambda)\mathbf{d} = \limsup_\lambda x_\lambda\mathbf{d}.$$
$$\mathbf{d}(y_\gamma) = \liminf_\gamma \mathbf{d}y_\gamma.$$

(The limits here are pointwise, i.e. in the product topology of $[0,\infty]^Y$ and $[0,\infty]^X$).

2. Distances

From now on fix a set X and $\mathbf{d} \in [0,\infty]^{X\times X}$.

We call $\mathbf{d}$ a *distance* if it satisfies the triangle inequality

$$(\triangle) \qquad \mathbf{d} \le \mathbf{d} \circ \mathbf{d}.$$

In particular, $\sqsubset \subseteq X \times X$ is a distance iff it is transitive in the usual sense. As $\mathbf{d} \mapsto \le^{\mathbf{d}}$ is functorial, this means $\le^{\mathbf{d}}$ is transitive whenever $\mathbf{d}$ is a distance. As in (Goubault-Larrecq 2013, Definition 6.1.1), we call $\mathbf{d}$ a *hemimetric* if $\le^{\mathbf{d}}$ is also reflexive (i.e. $= \subseteq \le^{\mathbf{d}}$) and hence a preorder.

Non-hemimetric distances have rarely been considered until now. However, the extra generality is vital if we want to consider distance analogs of non-reflexive transitive relations, like the way-below relation from domain theory. But there are at least two closely related hemimetrics associated to any generalized relation, which will be crucial to our later work.

Definition 2.1. *The upper and lower* reflexivizations *of* $\mathbf{d}$ *are defined by*

$$\overline{\mathbf{d}} = \mathbf{d}/\mathbf{d} \qquad \textit{so} \quad x\overline{\mathbf{d}}y = X(x\mathbf{d} - y\mathbf{d})_+ = \sup_{z\in X}(x\mathbf{d}z - y\mathbf{d}z)_+.$$
$$\underline{\mathbf{d}} = \mathbf{d}\backslash\mathbf{d} \qquad \textit{so} \quad x\underline{\mathbf{d}}y = X(\mathbf{d}y - \mathbf{d}x)_+ = \sup_{z\in X}(z\mathbf{d}y - z\mathbf{d}x)_+.$$

Proposition 2.2. *Both* $\overline{\mathbf{d}}$ *and* $\underline{\mathbf{d}}$ *are hemimetrics and* [1]

(2.1) $\quad \overline{\mathbf{d}} = \mathbf{d} \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \underline{\mathbf{d}} = \mathbf{d} \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \mathbf{d}$ *is a hemimetric.*

(2.2) $\quad \overline{\mathbf{d}} \le \mathbf{d} \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \underline{\mathbf{d}} \le \mathbf{d} \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \mathbf{d}$ *is a distance.*

(2.3) $\quad \overline{\mathbf{d}} \ge \mathbf{d} \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \underline{\mathbf{d}} \ge \mathbf{d} \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \le^{\mathbf{d}}$ *is reflexive.*

Moreover, $\mathbf{d} = \overline{\mathbf{d}} \circ \mathbf{d} = \mathbf{d} \circ \underline{\mathbf{d}}$.

Proof. We consider $\overline{\mathbf{d}}$, and the $\underline{\mathbf{d}}$ statements then follow by duality.

Note $\mathbf{d} \le (= \circ \mathbf{d})$ implies $\overline{\mathbf{d}} = \mathbf{d}/\mathbf{d} \le =$ so $\le^{\overline{\mathbf{d}}}$ is reflexive. Also $\mathbf{d}/\mathbf{d} \le \overline{\mathbf{d}}$ implies

$$\mathbf{d} \le \overline{\mathbf{d}} \circ \mathbf{d} \le (= \circ \mathbf{d}) = \mathbf{d} \quad \text{and}$$
$$\mathbf{d} \le \overline{\mathbf{d}} \circ \mathbf{d} \le \overline{\mathbf{d}} \circ \overline{\mathbf{d}} \circ \mathbf{d} \quad \text{so}$$
$$\overline{\mathbf{d}} = \mathbf{d}/\mathbf{d} \le \overline{\mathbf{d}} \circ \overline{\mathbf{d}}, \quad \text{i.e. } \overline{\mathbf{d}} \text{ is a distance.}$$

Thus $\overline{\mathbf{d}}$ is a hemimetric with $\mathbf{d} = \overline{\mathbf{d}} \circ \mathbf{d}$.

(2.1) Immediate from (2.2) and (2.3).

(2.2) $\mathbf{d} \le \mathbf{d} \circ \mathbf{d} \;\Leftrightarrow\; \mathbf{d}/\mathbf{d} \le \mathbf{d}$.

(2.3) As $\overline{\mathbf{d}} \le =$, if $\mathbf{d} \le \overline{\mathbf{d}}$ then $\mathbf{d} \le =$. If $\mathbf{d} \le =$ then $\mathbf{d} = (\mathbf{d}/=) \le \mathbf{d}/\mathbf{d} = \overline{\mathbf{d}}$. □

Sometimes it is convenient to identify points x and y that are $\mathbf{d}$-*equivalent* in the sense that $x\mathbf{d} = y\mathbf{d}$ and $\mathbf{d}x = \mathbf{d}y$. This is equivalent to $x\overline{\mathbf{d}}^{\vee}y = 0 = x\underline{\mathbf{d}}^{\vee}y$ and hence, if $\mathbf{d}$ is a hemimetric, to $x\mathbf{d}^{\vee}y = 0$, by (2.1). Thus this identification turns any hemimetric into a *quasimetric*, i.e. a hemimetric $\mathbf{d}$ with antisymmetric $\le^{\mathbf{d}}$.

For a simple example, consider $\mathbf{d}, \mathbf{q} \in [0,1]^{[0,1]\times[0,1]}$ given by

$$x\mathbf{d}y = x(1-y).$$
$$x\mathbf{q}y = (x-y)_+.$$

[1] The $\Leftarrow$ in (2.1) is a form of the Yoneda lemma – see (Goubault-Larrecq 2013, Exercise 7.5.26).

We immediately see that $\mathbf{q}$ is a quasimetric. Also, $\mathbf{d}$ is a distance as

$$x(1-y) = x(1-z+z)(1-y) \leq x(1-z) + z(1-y).$$

Moreover, as $(x-y)_+ = \sup_{z\in[0,1]} (x(1-z)-y(1-z))_+ = \sup_{z\in[0,1]} (z(1-y)-z(1-x))_+$,

$$\mathbf{q} = \overline{\mathbf{d}} = \underline{\mathbf{d}}.$$

Define the open upper/lower balls with centre $c \in X$ and radius $r \in [0,\infty]$ by

$$c^\bullet_r \quad = \quad c <^{\mathbf{d}}_r \quad = \quad \{x \in X : c\mathbf{d}x < r\}. \tag{2.4}$$

$$c^r_\bullet \quad = \quad <^{\mathbf{d}}_r c \quad = \quad \{x \in X : x\mathbf{d}c < r\}. \tag{2.5}$$

These characterize $\overline{\mathbf{d}}$ and $\underline{\mathbf{d}}$ respectively by

$$x\overline{\mathbf{d}}y = \inf\{\epsilon > 0 : \forall r \in [0,\infty]\ y^\bullet_r \subseteq x^\bullet_{r+\epsilon}\}.$$
$$x\underline{\mathbf{d}}y = \inf\{\epsilon > 0 : \forall r \in [0,\infty]\ x^r_\bullet \subseteq y^{r+\epsilon}_\bullet\}.$$

In particular, for any $\sqsubset \subseteq X \times X$,

$$x \mathrel{\overline{\sqsubset}} y \qquad \Leftrightarrow \qquad (y \sqsubset) \subseteq (x \sqsubset).$$
$$x \sqsubseteq y \qquad \Leftrightarrow \qquad (\sqsubset x) \subseteq (\sqsubset y).$$

This observation yields more examples, e.g. for the strict ordering $<$ on $[0,\infty]$, $\overline{<}$ and $\leq$ coincide with the usual ordering on $[0,\infty]$. More generally, if X is a domain with way-below relation $\ll$ then $\underline{\ll}$ gives back the original ordering $\leq$ on X. From this dual point of view, the reflexivization $\leq$ defined from a transitive relation $<$ is just as important as the way-below relation $\ll$ defined from a partial order $\leq$. Indeed, our thesis is that the same is true for non-symmetric distances as well.

Lastly, let us make an observation about restrictions. Specifically, for any $Y \subseteq X$ let $\mathbf{d}|_Y = \mathbf{d}|_{Y\times Y}$ denote the restriction of $\mathbf{d}$ to Y. Also identify Y with $=|_Y$, i.e.

$$Y(x,y) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } x = y \in Y \\ \infty & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

so $\mathbf{d} \circ Y \circ \mathbf{e}$ then denotes composition restricted to Y, i.e.

$$x(\mathbf{d} \circ Y \circ \mathbf{e})z = \inf_{y\in Y}(x\mathbf{d}y + y\mathbf{e}z).$$

Proposition 2.3. *If $\mathbf{d}$ is a distance, $Y \subseteq X$ and $\mathbf{d} \circ Y \circ \mathbf{d} \leq \mathbf{d}$ then*

$$\overline{\mathbf{d}|_Y} = \overline{\mathbf{d}}|_Y \qquad \text{and} \qquad \underline{\mathbf{d}|_Y} = \underline{\mathbf{d}}|_Y.$$

Proof. We prove the first equality, the second then follows by duality.

We immediately see that $\overline{\mathbf{d}|_Y} \leq \overline{\mathbf{d}}|_Y$. Conversely, for $x, y \in Y$,

$$\begin{aligned} x\overline{\mathbf{d}}y &= \sup_{z\in X}(x\mathbf{d}z - y\mathbf{d}z)_+ \\ &\leq \sup_{z\in X}(x\mathbf{d}z - y(\mathbf{d}\circ Y\circ\mathbf{d})z)_+. \\ &= \sup_{z\in X, w\in Y}(x\mathbf{d}z - y\mathbf{d}w - w\mathbf{d}z)_+. \\ &\leq \sup_{w\in Y}(x\mathbf{d}w - y\mathbf{d}w)_+. \\ &= x\overline{\mathbf{d}_Y}y. \end{aligned}$$

□

3. Cauchy Nets

Definition 3.1. *For any net $(x_\lambda) \subseteq X$, define*

$$(x_\lambda)(x_\lambda)\mathbf{d}^{\mathrm{op}} = 0 \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad (x_\lambda) \text{ is } \mathbf{d}\text{-pre-Cauchy}. \tag{3.1}$$

$$\lim_{\gamma \prec \delta} x_\gamma \mathbf{d} x_\delta = 0 \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad (x_\lambda) \text{ is } \mathbf{d}\text{-Cauchy}. \tag{3.2}$$

Recall from §1 that $(x_\lambda)(x_\lambda)\mathbf{d}^{\mathrm{op}} = \limsup_\gamma \limsup_\delta x_\gamma \mathbf{d} x_\delta$. And just to be clear, in (3.2) we consider $\prec$ itself as a directed subset of $\Lambda \times \Lambda$ ordered by $\prec \times \prec$. So

$$\lim_\gamma \limsup_\delta x_\gamma \mathbf{d} x_\delta = 0 \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad (x_\lambda) \text{ is } \mathbf{d}\text{-}\textit{pre-Cauchy}.$$

$$\lim_\gamma \sup_{\gamma \prec \delta} x_\gamma \mathbf{d} x_\delta = 0 \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad (x_\lambda) \text{ is } \mathbf{d}\text{-}\textit{Cauchy}.$$

These nets can also be characterized by $\Phi^{\mathbf{d}}$, specifically

$$\forall \sqsubset \in \Phi^{\mathbf{d}}\ \exists \alpha\ \forall \gamma \succ \alpha\ \exists \beta\ \forall \delta \succ \beta\ (x_\gamma \sqsubset x_\delta) \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad (x_\lambda) \text{ is } \mathbf{d}\text{-}\textit{pre-Cauchy}.$$

$$\forall \sqsubset \in \Phi^{\mathbf{d}}\ \exists \alpha\ \forall \gamma \succ \alpha \qquad \forall \delta \succ \gamma\ (x_\gamma \sqsubset x_\delta) \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad (x_\lambda) \text{ is } \mathbf{d}\text{-}\textit{Cauchy}.$$

Proposition 3.2. *If $\mathbf{d}$ is a symmetric distance, i.e. $\mathbf{d} = \mathbf{d}^{\mathrm{op}} \leq \mathbf{d} \circ \mathbf{d}$,*[2] *then*

$$(x_\lambda) \textit{ is } \mathbf{d}\textit{-Cauchy} \qquad \Leftrightarrow \qquad (x_\lambda) \textit{ is } \mathbf{d}\textit{-pre-Cauchy}.$$

Proof. The $\Rightarrow$ part is immediate. Conversely, if $(x_\lambda) \subseteq X$ is $\mathbf{d}$-pre-Cauchy then, for every $\epsilon > 0$, we have α, β such that, for all $\gamma \succ \beta$, $x_\alpha \mathbf{d} x_\gamma < \epsilon$. Thus, for all $\delta \succ \gamma$, $\mathbf{d} = \mathbf{d}^{\mathrm{op}} \leq \mathbf{d} \circ \mathbf{d}$ yields $x_\gamma \mathbf{d} x_\delta \leq x_\alpha \mathbf{d} x_\gamma + x_\alpha \mathbf{d} x_\delta < 2\epsilon$, i.e. (x_λ) is $\mathbf{d}$-Cauchy. □

Thus both (3.1) and (3.2) extend the usual metric theoretic notion of a Cauchy net. Moreover, if $\leq$ is a partial order then $\leq$-Cauchy nets are precisely the increasing nets, at least beyond a certain point. This perhaps the reason why $\mathbf{d}$-Cauchy nets are more often considered than $\mathbf{d}$-pre-Cauchy nets. However, most results on $\mathbf{d}$-Cauchy nets can be generalized to $\mathbf{d}$-pre-Cauchy nets without difficulty, as we demonstrate, and these are sometimes more convenient to work with.

Proposition 3.3.

(1) If $(x_\lambda) \subseteq X$ is $\mathbf{d}$-pre-Cauchy then (x_λ) has a $\mathbf{d}$-Cauchy subnet.
(2) If $(x_\lambda) \subseteq X$ is $\overline{\mathbf{d}}$-pre-Cauchy then $x_\lambda \mathbf{d}$ converges (pointwise).
(3) If $(x_\lambda) \subseteq X$ is $\underline{\mathbf{d}}$-pre-Cauchy then $\mathbf{d} x_\lambda$ converges (pointwise) and

$$(x_\lambda)\underline{\mathbf{d}}y = X(\mathbf{d}y - \mathbf{d}(x_\lambda))_+. \tag{3.3}$$

(4) If $(x_\lambda) \subseteq X$ is $\mathbf{d}$-pre-Cauchy and $\mathbf{d}$ is a distance then

$$\mathbf{d}(x_\lambda) = \overline{\mathbf{d}}(x_\lambda) \qquad \textit{and} \qquad (x_\lambda)\mathbf{d} = (x_\lambda)\underline{\mathbf{d}}. \tag{3.4}$$

Proof.

(1) If Λ is finite then it has a maximum γ, which means the single element net x_γ is a $\mathbf{d}$-Cauchy subnet. Otherwise, consider $\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)$ directed by $\subsetneq$ and define a map $f : \mathcal{F}(\Lambda) \to \Lambda$ recursively as follows. Let $f(\{\lambda\}) = \lambda$, for all $\lambda \in \Lambda$. Given $F \in \mathcal{F}(\Lambda)$, take $f(F) \in \Lambda$ such that, for all $E \subsetneq F$, $f(E) \prec f(F)$ and

$$x_{f(E)} \mathbf{d} x_{f(F)} \leq \limsup_\lambda x_{f(E)} \mathbf{d} x_\lambda + 2^{-|E|}.$$

[2] Actually $\mathbf{d} \approx \mathbf{d}^{\mathrm{op}} \precsim \mathbf{d} \circ \mathbf{d}$ would suffice.

As (x_λ) is $\mathbf{d}$-pre-Cauchy and $\lambda \prec f(E)$ whenever $\lambda \in E \neq \{\lambda\}$,

$$\lim_{E\in\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)} \limsup_\lambda x_{f(E)}\mathbf{d}x_\lambda + 2^{-|E|} = 0$$

Thus $(x_{f(F)})$ is a $\mathbf{d}$-Cauchy subnet of (x_λ).

(2) If (x_λ) is $\overline{\mathbf{d}}$-pre-Cauchy then, for all $y \in X$,

$$\limsup_\lambda x_\lambda \mathbf{d}y \leq \limsup_\lambda \liminf_\gamma (x_\lambda \overline{\mathbf{d}} x_\gamma + x_\gamma \mathbf{d}y) = \liminf_\gamma x_\gamma \mathbf{d}y.$$

(3) If (x_λ) is $\underline{\mathbf{d}}$-pre-Cauchy then, for all $y \in X$,

$$\limsup_\lambda y\mathbf{d}x_\lambda \leq \liminf_\gamma \limsup_\lambda (y\mathbf{d}x_\gamma + x_\gamma \underline{\mathbf{d}} x_\lambda) = \liminf_\gamma y\mathbf{d}x_\gamma.$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Also } (x_\lambda)\underline{\mathbf{d}}y &= \lim_\lambda \sup_{z\in X} (z\mathbf{d}y - z\mathbf{d}x_\lambda)_+. \\
&\leq \lim_\lambda \sup_{z\in X} \lim_\gamma (z\mathbf{d}y - z\mathbf{d}x_\gamma + x_\lambda \underline{\mathbf{d}} x_\gamma)_+ \\
&\leq \sup_{z\in X} \lim_\gamma (z\mathbf{d}y - z\mathbf{d}x_\gamma)_+ + \lim_\lambda \lim_\gamma x_\lambda \underline{\mathbf{d}} x_\gamma \\
&= X(\mathbf{d}y - \mathbf{d}(x_\lambda))_+. \\
&\leq \sup_{z\in X} \lim_\lambda x_\lambda \underline{\mathbf{d}} y \\
&= (x_\lambda)\underline{\mathbf{d}}y.
\end{aligned}$$

(4) As $\overline{\mathbf{d}}, \underline{\mathbf{d}} \leq \mathbf{d}$, we immediately have $\overline{\mathbf{d}}(x_\lambda) \leq \mathbf{d}(x_\lambda)$ and $(x_\lambda)\underline{\mathbf{d}} \leq (x_\lambda)\mathbf{d}$. As (x_λ) is $\mathbf{d}$-pre-Cauchy (and hence $\overline{\mathbf{d}}$-pre-Cauchy and $\underline{\mathbf{d}}$-pre-Cauchy),

$$\begin{aligned}
y\mathbf{d}(x_\lambda) &\leq \lim_\lambda \lim_\gamma (y\underline{\mathbf{d}}x_\lambda + x_\lambda \mathbf{d}x_\gamma) = y\underline{\mathbf{d}}(x_\lambda). \\
(x_\lambda)\mathbf{d}y &\leq \lim_\lambda \lim_\gamma (x_\lambda \mathbf{d}x_\gamma + x_\gamma \overline{\mathbf{d}} y) = (x_\lambda)\overline{\mathbf{d}}y.
\end{aligned}$$

□

4. Topology

Define the open upper/lower holes with centre $c \in X$ and radius $r \in [0,\infty]$ by

$$\begin{aligned}
c^\circ_r &= {>^{\mathbf{d}}_r} c = \{x \in X : x\mathbf{d}c > r\}. \\
c^r_\circ &= c {>^{\mathbf{d}}_r} = \{x \in X : c\mathbf{d}x > r\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Note these are defined just like open balls in (2.4) and (2.5) but with $<$ reversed. Let $\mathbf{d}^\bullet$, $\mathbf{d}_\bullet$, $\mathbf{d}^\circ$, $\mathbf{d}_\circ$, $\mathbf{d}^\bullet_\bullet$, $\mathbf{d}^\bullet_\circ$, $\mathbf{d}^\circ_\bullet$ and $\mathbf{d}^\circ_\circ$ denote the topologies generated by the corresponding balls and holes, i.e. by arbitrary unions of finite intersections.

Up until now, most of the literature has focused on ball topologies. However, as mentioned in (Goubault-Larrecq 2013) Exercise 6.2.11, hole topologies generalize the upper topology from order theory. This allows for simple generalizations of certain order theoretic concepts. Also, the double hole topology $\mathbf{d}^\circ_\circ$ coincides with various kinds of weak topologies, although this too does not appear to be widely recognized. For example, the double hole topology is the usual product topology on products of bounded intervals, the Wijsman topology on subsets of X, and the weak operator topology on projections on a Hilbert space.

Denote convergence by $\xrightarrow{\bullet}$, $\xrightarrow{}_\bullet$, $\xrightarrow{\circ}$, $\xrightarrow{}_\circ$, etc. so, for any net $(x_\lambda) \subseteq X$,

$$x_\lambda \xrightarrow{}_\bullet x \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad (x_\lambda)\mathbf{d} \leq x\mathbf{d}. \tag{4.1}$$

$$x_\lambda \xrightarrow{}_\circ x \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \mathbf{d}(x_\lambda) \geq \mathbf{d}x. \tag{4.2}$$

These are not 'uniform' concepts in general, as they depend crucially on $\mathbf{d}$ not just $\Phi^{\mathbf{d}}$. This is in contrast to the usual metric theoretic notion of convergence, namely

$$x_\lambda \mathbf{d} x \to 0 \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \forall \sqsubset \in \Phi^{\mathbf{d}}\ \exists \lambda\ \forall \gamma \succ \lambda (x_\gamma \sqsubset x). \tag{4.3}$$

Below we will usually try to use uniform concepts, but the inherent non-uniform nature of convergence means this is not always possible. However, we do get some degree of uniformity by considering $\overline{\mathbf{d}}$ and $\underline{\mathbf{d}}$ or adding extra assumptions.

Proposition 4.1.

$$x_\lambda \underline{\mathbf{d}} x \to 0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad x_\lambda \underset{\circ}{\to} x. \tag{4.4}$$

$$x_\lambda \overline{\mathbf{d}} x \to 0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad x_\lambda \underset{\bullet}{\to} x. \tag{4.5}$$

$$x_\lambda \mathbf{d} x \to 0 \quad \Leftarrow \quad x_\lambda \underset{\bullet}{\to} x \leq^{\mathbf{d}} x. \tag{4.6}$$

Proof.

(4.4) If $x_\lambda \underline{\mathbf{d}} x \to 0$ then $c\mathbf{d}x \leq \liminf_\lambda (c\mathbf{d}x_\lambda + x_\lambda \underline{\mathbf{d}} x) = c\mathbf{d}(x_\lambda)$.
(4.5) If $x_\lambda \overline{\mathbf{d}} x \to 0$ then $x\mathbf{d}c \geq \limsup_\lambda (x_\lambda \mathbf{d}c - x_\lambda \overline{\mathbf{d}} x) = (x_\lambda)\mathbf{d}c$.
(4.6) If $x_\lambda \underset{\bullet}{\to} x \leq^{\mathbf{d}} x$ then $\limsup_\lambda x_\lambda \mathbf{d} x = (x_\lambda)\mathbf{d}x \leq x\mathbf{d}x = 0$. □

In (Goubault-Larrecq 2013) Definition 7.1.15, any x with $(x_\lambda)\mathbf{d} = x\mathbf{d}$ is called a $\mathbf{d}$-*limit* of (x_λ) (these are called *forward limits* in (Bonsangue et al. 1998) before Proposition 3.3 and just *limits* in (Künzi and Schellekens 2002) Definition 11). In general, $\mathbf{d}$-limits are not true limits in any topological sense, as they are not preserved by taking subnets. But for $\overline{\mathbf{d}}$-pre-Cauchy nets, $\mathbf{d}$-limits are $\mathbf{d}^\circ_\bullet$-limits, as noted below and in (Wagner 1997) Theorem 2.26.

Proposition 4.2. *If (x_λ) is $\overline{\mathbf{d}}$-pre-Cauchy with subnet (y_γ) then*

$$x_\lambda \overset{\circ}{\underset{\bullet}{\to}} x \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad (x_\lambda)\mathbf{d} = x\mathbf{d} \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad y_\gamma \overset{\circ}{\underset{\bullet}{\to}} x. \tag{4.7}$$

If (x_λ) is $\underline{\mathbf{d}}$-pre-Cauchy with subnet (y_γ) then

$$x_\lambda \overset{\bullet}{\underset{\circ}{\to}} x \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \mathbf{d}(x_\lambda) = \mathbf{d}x \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad y_\gamma \overset{\bullet}{\underset{\circ}{\to}} x. \tag{4.8}$$

$$x_\lambda \overset{\bullet}{\underset{\circ}{\to}} x \quad \Rightarrow \quad (x_\lambda)\underline{\mathbf{d}} = x\underline{\mathbf{d}}. \tag{4.9}$$

$$x_\lambda \overset{\bullet}{\underset{\circ}{\to}} x \quad \Leftarrow \quad (x_\lambda)\underline{\mathbf{d}} = x\underline{\mathbf{d}} \quad \textit{and} \quad x_\lambda \overset{\bullet}{\underset{\circ}{\to}} y. \tag{4.10}$$

If (x_λ) is $\mathbf{d}$-pre-Cauchy and $\mathbf{d}$ is a distance then

$$x_\lambda \underset{\circ}{\to} x \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad x_\lambda \mathbf{d} x \to 0. \tag{4.11}$$

$$x_\lambda \overset{\circ}{\underset{\circ}{\to}} x \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad x_\lambda \overset{\circ}{\underset{\bullet}{\to}} x \leq^{\mathbf{d}} x. \tag{4.12}$$

Proof.

(4.7) $x_\lambda \overset{\circ}{\to} x$ iff $\mathbf{d}^{\mathrm{op}} x \leq \mathbf{d}^{\mathrm{op}}(x_\lambda)$. But $\mathbf{d}^{\mathrm{op}} x = x\mathbf{d}$ and, as X is $\overline{\mathbf{d}}$-pre-Cauchy, $\mathbf{d}^{\mathrm{op}}(x_\lambda) = \liminf_\lambda x_\lambda \mathbf{d} = \limsup_\lambda x_\lambda \mathbf{d} = (x_\lambda)\mathbf{d}$, by Proposition 3.3 (2). So $x_\lambda \overset{\circ}{\to} x$ iff $x\mathbf{d} \leq (x_\lambda)\mathbf{d}$, while $x_\lambda \underset{\bullet}{\to} x$ iff $x\mathbf{d} \geq (x_\lambda)\mathbf{d}$. By Proposition 3.3 (2) again, $(x_\lambda)\mathbf{d} = (y_\gamma)\mathbf{d}$, which yields the second equivalence.
(4.8) Apply Proposition 3.3 (3) as above.
(4.9) By (3.3) and (4.8),

$$(x_\lambda)\underline{\mathbf{d}} y = X(\mathbf{d}y - \mathbf{d}(x_\lambda))_+ = X(\mathbf{d}y - \mathbf{d}x)_+ = x\underline{\mathbf{d}} y.$$

(4.10) As $(x_\lambda)\underline{\mathbf{d}}x = x\underline{\mathbf{d}}x = 0$, (4.4) yields $x_\lambda \underset{\circ}{\to} x$. On the other hand, (4.9) yields $x\underline{\mathbf{d}}y = (x_\lambda)\underline{\mathbf{d}}y = y\underline{\mathbf{d}}y = 0$, i.e. $x \leq^{\underline{\mathbf{d}}} y$. Then $\mathbf{d} \leq \mathbf{d} \circ \underline{\mathbf{d}}$ and (4.8) yield $(x_\lambda)\mathbf{d}^{\mathrm{op}} = \mathbf{d}(x_\lambda) = \mathbf{d}y \leq \mathbf{d}x = x\mathbf{d}^{\mathrm{op}}$, i.e. $x_\lambda \overset{\bullet}{\to} x$.

(4.11) By (3.4), $(x_\lambda)\mathbf{d} = (x_\lambda)\underline{\mathbf{d}}$. Thus it suffices to prove

$$x_\lambda \underset{\circ}{\to} x \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad x_\lambda \underline{\mathbf{d}} x \to 0,$$

for $\underline{\mathbf{d}}$-Cauchy (x_λ). The $\Leftarrow$ part (4.4). Conversely, $x_\lambda \underset{\circ}{\to} x$ and (3.3) yield

$$(x_\lambda)\underline{\mathbf{d}}x = X(\mathbf{d}x - \mathbf{d}(x_\lambda))_+ \leq X(\mathbf{d}x - \mathbf{d}x)_+ = 0.$$

(4.12) If $x_\lambda \mathbf{d}x \to 0$ and $x_\lambda \overset{\circ}{\to} x$ then $x\mathbf{d}x \leq (x_\lambda)\mathbf{d}x = 0$, i.e. $x \leq^{\mathbf{d}} x$. By (4.11), this proves $\Rightarrow$ while (4.6) proves $\Leftarrow$. □

For hemimetric $\mathbf{d}$, (4.3), (4.5) and (4.6) show that $\mathbf{d}_\bullet$-convergence is uniform. But for general distance $\mathbf{d}$ it is rather $\mathbf{d}_\circ$-convergence that is uniform, at least for $\mathbf{d}$-pre-Cauchy nets, by (4.11).

Also note (4.9) and (4.10) describe a close relationship between $\mathbf{d}^\bullet_\circ$-limits and $\underline{\mathbf{d}}^\circ_\circ$-limits of $\underline{\mathbf{d}}$-Cauchy (x_λ) (as (4.7) and (4.12) show $x = \underline{\mathbf{d}}^\circ_\circ\text{-}\lim x_\lambda$ iff $(x_\lambda)\underline{\mathbf{d}} = x\underline{\mathbf{d}}$). Namely, every $\mathbf{d}^\bullet_\circ$-limit is a $\underline{\mathbf{d}}^\circ_\circ$-limit, by (4.9), while conversely the mere existence of a $\mathbf{d}^\bullet_\circ$-limit guarantees that any $\underline{\mathbf{d}}^\circ_\circ$-limit is a $\mathbf{d}^\bullet_\circ$-limit, by (4.10).

For a simple example of a $\mathbf{d}$-Cauchy net where $x_\lambda \overset{\circ}{\underset{\bullet}{\to}} x \not\leq^{\mathbf{d}} x$ and hence $x_\lambda \not\overset{\bullet}{\underset{\circ}{\to}} x$, take any $x_\lambda \to 0 < x$ in $[0, \infty)$, taking the coordinate projection $y\mathbf{d}z = z$ for $\mathbf{d}$.

5. Directed Subsets

Definition 5.1. *For any $Y \subseteq X$, we define the following.*

$$\forall F \in \mathcal{F}(Y)\ (F\mathbf{d})Y = 0 \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad Y \text{ is } \mathbf{d}\text{-directed.}$$
$$Y(\mathbf{d}Y) = 0 \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad Y \text{ is } \mathbf{d}\text{-final.}$$

If $\leq^{\mathbf{d}}$ is reflexive, any $Y \subseteq X$ is $\mathbf{d}$-final. Also recall $x\mathbf{0}y = 0$, for all $x, y \in X$, so

$$\mathcal{F}\mathbf{d} \circ \mathbf{0} = \mathbf{0} \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad X \text{ is } \mathbf{d}\text{-directed.}$$
$$\mathbf{d} \circ \mathbf{0} = \mathbf{0} \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad X \text{ is } \mathbf{d}\text{-final.}$$

Indeed, Definition 5.1 is saying the same thing, just relative to Y.

Proposition 5.2. *If $\mathbf{d}$ is a distance and Y is $\mathbf{d}$-final then*

(5.1) $$\forall F \in \mathcal{F}(X)\ (F\mathbf{d})Y = F(\mathbf{d}Y) \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad Y \text{ is } \mathbf{d}\text{-directed.}$$

(5.2) $$\overline{\mathbf{d}}Y = \mathbf{d}Y \quad \text{and} \quad Y\underline{\mathbf{d}} = Y\mathbf{d}.$$

Proof.

(5.1) If Y is $\mathbf{d}$-final and, for all $F \in \mathcal{F}(X)$, $(F\mathbf{d})Y = F(\mathbf{d}Y)$ then in particular, for all $F \in \mathcal{F}(Y)$, we have $(F\mathbf{d})Y = F(\mathbf{d}Y) = 0$, i.e. Y is $\mathbf{d}$-directed.

For each $x \in F$, $x\mathbf{d}Y \leq (F\mathbf{d})Y$ so $F(\mathbf{d}Y) \leq (F\mathbf{d})Y$. Conversely, say Y is $\mathbf{d}$-directed and take $\epsilon > 0$. For each $x \in F$, we have $x' \in Y$ with $x\mathbf{d}x' < x\mathbf{d}Y + \epsilon \leq F(\mathbf{d}Y) + \epsilon$. Then we can take $y \in Y$ with $F'\mathbf{d}y < \epsilon$, where $F' = \{x' : x \in F\}$. If $\mathbf{d}$ is a distance then $F\mathbf{d}y \leq F(\mathbf{d}Y) + 2\epsilon$. As $\epsilon > 0$ was arbitrary, $(F\mathbf{d})Y \leq F(\mathbf{d}Y)$.

(5.2) If $\mathbf{d}$ is a distance and Y is $\mathbf{d}$-final then

$$Y\mathbf{d}z \leq Y(\mathbf{d} \circ \underline{\mathbf{d}})z \leq \sup_{y \in Y} \inf_{x \in Y} (y\mathbf{d}x + x\underline{\mathbf{d}}z) \leq \sup_{y \in Y} (y\mathbf{d}Y + Y\underline{\mathbf{d}}z) = Y\underline{\mathbf{d}}z.$$

Thus $Y\mathbf{d} = Y\underline{\mathbf{d}}$, by (2.2). Likewise $\mathbf{d}Y = \overline{\mathbf{d}}Y$ by (2.2) and

$$z\mathbf{d}Y \leq z(\overline{\mathbf{d}} \circ \mathbf{d})Y \leq \inf_{x,y\in Y}(z\overline{\mathbf{d}}x + x\mathbf{d}y) = \inf_{x\in Y}(z\overline{\mathbf{d}}x + x\mathbf{d}Y) = z\overline{\mathbf{d}}Y. \qquad \square$$

Recall our identification of relations with characteristic functions so $Y \leq^{\mathbf{d}} x$ means $y \leq^{\mathbf{d}} x$, for all $y \in Y$. For any $(x_\lambda) \subseteq X$ and $Y \subseteq X$, let us also define

$$(x_\lambda) \leq^{\mathbf{d}} Y \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad (x_\lambda)(\mathbf{d}Y) = 0 \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad x_\lambda \mathbf{d}Y \to 0.$$
$$Y \leq^{\mathbf{d}} (x_\lambda) \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad Y(x_\lambda)\mathbf{d}^{\mathrm{op}} = 0 \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad y\mathbf{d}x_\lambda \to 0, \text{ for all } y \in Y.$$

Actually, $Y \leq^{\mathbf{d}} (x_\lambda)$ can likewise be defined by $Y(\mathbf{d}(x_\lambda)) = 0$ if (x_λ) is $\underline{\mathbf{d}}$-pre-Cauchy, as then Proposition 3.3 (3) yields $\mathbf{d}(x_\lambda) = (x_\lambda)\mathbf{d}^{\mathrm{op}}$.

Proposition 5.3.

(5.3) $x_\lambda \overset{\to}{\circ} x$ *and* $Y \leq^{\mathbf{d}} (x_\lambda) \quad \Rightarrow \quad Y \leq^{\mathbf{d}} x.$

(5.4) $(x_\lambda) \leq^{\mathbf{d}} Y \leq^{\mathbf{d}} (x_\lambda) \quad \Rightarrow \quad (x_\lambda)$ *is* $\mathbf{d}$*-pre-Cauchy.*

(5.5) $\exists (x_\lambda) \leq^{\mathbf{d}} Y \leq^{\mathbf{d}} (x_\lambda) \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad Y$ *is* $\mathbf{d}$*-directed.*

If $\mathbf{d}$ *is a distance and* X *is* $\overline{\mathbf{d}}^{\bullet}_{\bullet}$*-separable then*

(5.6) $\exists (x_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \leq^{\mathbf{d}} Y \leq^{\mathbf{d}} (x_n) \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad Y$ *is* $\mathbf{d}$*-directed.*

Proof.

(5.3) If $Y \leq^{\mathbf{d}} (x_\lambda)$ and $x_\lambda \overset{\to}{\circ} x$ then, for all $y \in Y$, $y\mathbf{d}x \leq y\mathbf{d}(x_\lambda) = 0$.

(5.4) If $(x_\lambda) \leq^{\mathbf{d}} Y \leq^{\mathbf{d}} (x_\lambda)$ then

$$\begin{aligned}
(x_\lambda)(x_\lambda)\mathbf{d}^{\mathrm{op}} &= \limsup_\gamma \limsup_\delta x_\gamma \mathbf{d} x_\delta \\
&\leq \limsup_\gamma \inf_{y\in Y} \limsup_\delta (x_\gamma \mathbf{d}y + y\mathbf{d}x_\delta) \\
&= \limsup_\gamma \inf_{y\in Y} (x_\gamma \mathbf{d}y + \limsup_\delta y\mathbf{d}x_\delta) \\
&\leq \limsup_\gamma (\inf_{y\in Y} x_\gamma \mathbf{d}y + \sup_{y\in Y} \limsup_\delta y\mathbf{d}x_\delta) \\
&= (x_\lambda)(\mathbf{d}Y) + Y(x_\lambda)\mathbf{d}^{\mathrm{op}}. \\
&= 0.
\end{aligned}$$

(5.5) If $(x_\lambda) \leq^{\mathbf{d}} Y \leq^{\mathbf{d}} (x_\lambda)$ then, for any $F \in \mathcal{F}(Y)$,

$$(F\mathbf{d})Y \leq \liminf_\lambda (F\mathbf{d}x_\lambda + x_\lambda \mathbf{d}Y) \leq (F\mathbf{d})(x_\lambda) + (x_\lambda)(\mathbf{d}Y) = 0,$$

i.e. Y is $\mathbf{d}$-directed. Conversely, if Y is $\mathbf{d}$-directed then, for $F \in \mathcal{F}(Y)$ and $\epsilon > 0$, take $y_{F,\epsilon} \in Y$ with $F\mathbf{d}y_{F,\epsilon} < \epsilon$. Ordering $\mathcal{F}(Y) \times (0,\infty)$ by $\subseteq \times \geq$, we have $(y_{F,\epsilon}) \subseteq Y \leq^{\mathbf{d}} (y_{F,\epsilon})$ and hence $(y_{F,\epsilon}) \leq^{\mathbf{d}} Y \leq^{\mathbf{d}} (y_{F,\epsilon})$.

(5.6) For any distance $\mathbf{e}$,

$$X \text{ is } \mathbf{e}\text{-final and } \mathbf{e}^{\bullet}\text{-separable} \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad X(\mathbf{e}Z) = 0 \text{ for countable } Z.$$

As $\overline{\mathbf{d}}$ is hemimetric, X is trivially $\overline{\mathbf{d}}^{\vee}$-final and $\overline{\mathbf{d}}^{\vee\bullet}$-separability is equivalent to $\overline{\mathbf{d}}^{\bullet}_{\bullet}$-separability. So we can take $\mathbf{e} = \overline{\mathbf{d}}^{\vee}$ above and let (z_n) enumerate such a countable Z. If Y is $\mathbf{d}$-directed then, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we can take $x_n \in Y$ with $z_k\mathbf{d}x_n \leq z_k\mathbf{d}Y + 1/n$, for all $k \leq n$. For any $y \in Y$ and $\epsilon > 0$, we have

$N \in \mathbb{N}$ with $y(\overline{\mathbf{d}}^\vee)z_N < \epsilon$ and hence $z_N \mathbf{d} Y \leq z_N \overline{\mathbf{d}} y + y \mathbf{d} Y < \epsilon$. Thus, for any $n \geq N$, $y\mathbf{d}x_n \leq y\overline{\mathbf{d}}z_N + z_N \mathbf{d}x_n \leq 2\epsilon + 1/n$, i.e. $Y \leq^{\mathbf{d}} (x_n)$. □

Mostly we use $\mathbf{d}$-directed subsets, but often they can be replaced by $\mathbf{d}$-ideals.

Definition 5.4. *We call $I \subseteq X$ a* $\mathbf{d}$-ideal *if, for all $F \in \mathcal{F}(X)$,*

$$F \subseteq I \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad (F\mathbf{d})I = 0.$$

Equivalently, $I \subseteq X$ is a $\mathbf{d}$-ideal iff I is $\mathbf{d}$-directed and $\overline{\mathbf{d}}^\bullet$-closed.

Proposition 5.5. *If $\mathbf{d}$ is a distance then the $\overline{\mathbf{d}}^\bullet$-closure of any $\mathbf{d}$-final $Y \subseteq X$ is*

$$\overline{Y}^{\overline{\bullet}} = \{x \in X : x\mathbf{d}Y = 0\}. \tag{5.7}$$

If Y is $\mathbf{d}$-directed then $\overline{Y}^{\overline{\bullet}}$ is the smallest $\mathbf{d}$-ideal containing Y.

Proof. If $\mathbf{d}$ is a distance and $x\mathbf{d}Y = 0$ then whenever $x \in (c_1)^\bullet_{r_1} \cap \ldots \cap (c_n)^\bullet_{r_n}$, we have $y \in Y$ with $x\mathbf{d}y < (r_1 - c_1\mathbf{d}x) \wedge \ldots \wedge (r_1 - c_1\mathbf{d}x)$ so $y \in (c_1)^\bullet_{r_1} \cap \ldots \cap (c_n)^\bullet_{r_n}$, i.e. $x \in \overline{Y}^\bullet (=$ the $\mathbf{d}^\bullet$-closure of $Y)$. Conversely, if $\leq^{\mathbf{d}}$ is reflexive and $x\mathbf{d}Y = \epsilon > 0$ then $x^\bullet_\epsilon \cap Y = \emptyset$ while $x \in x^\bullet_\epsilon$, i.e. $x \notin \overline{Y}^\bullet$. Thus if $\mathbf{d}$ is a hemimetric then

$$\overline{Y}^\bullet = \{x \in X : x\mathbf{d}Y = 0\}.$$

If $\mathbf{d}$ is a distance and Y is $\mathbf{d}$-final then $\overline{\mathbf{d}}$ is a hemimetric and $\overline{\mathbf{d}}Y = \mathbf{d}Y$ so

$$\overline{Y}^{\overline{\bullet}} = \{x \in X : x\overline{\mathbf{d}}Y = 0\} = \{x \in X : x\mathbf{d}Y = 0\}.$$

This means any $\mathbf{d}$-ideal containing Y must contain $\overline{Y}^{\overline{\bullet}}$. But if Y is $\mathbf{d}$-directed then

$$F \subseteq \overline{Y}^{\overline{\bullet}} \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad F(\mathbf{d}Y) = (F\mathbf{d})Y = 0 \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad (F\mathbf{d})\overline{Y}^{\overline{\bullet}} = 0,$$

as $Y \subseteq \overline{Y}^{\overline{\bullet}}$ and $\overline{Y}^{\overline{\bullet}}(\mathbf{d}Y) = 0$, so $\overline{Y}^{\overline{\bullet}}$ itself is a $\mathbf{d}$-ideal. □

6. Upper Bounds

Next we examine '$\mathbf{d}$-minimal' upper bounds of $\mathbf{d}$-directed subsets.

Definition 6.1. *Define* $\mathbf{d}$-suprema *and* $\mathbf{d}$-maxima *of $Y \subseteq X$ by*

$$x = \mathbf{d}\text{-sup}\, Y \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad Y \leq^{\mathbf{d}} x \quad \textit{and} \quad Y\mathbf{d} \geq x\mathbf{d}. \tag{6.1}$$

$$x = \mathbf{d}\text{-max}\, Y \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad Y \leq^{\mathbf{d}} x \quad \textit{and} \quad \mathbf{d}Y \leq \mathbf{d}x. \tag{6.2}$$

Note $\mathbf{d}$-suprema and $\mathbf{d}$-maxima are not necessarily unique, so $=$ here is not really equality. Put another way, we are officially taking $\mathbf{d}$-sup and $\mathbf{d}$-max as relations, not functions, and adding the $=$ symbol simply for consistency with standard supremum/maximum notation. We consider $\mathbf{d}$-suprema and $\mathbf{d}$-maxima analogous to $\mathbf{d}^\circ_\circ$-limits and $\mathbf{d}^\bullet_\circ$-limits respectively, as indicated by the following analog of Proposition 4.2.

Proposition 6.2. *If $\mathbf{d}$ is a distance then, for any $Y \subseteq X$,*

$$x = \mathbf{d}\text{-sup}\, Y \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad Y\mathbf{d} = x\mathbf{d} \quad \textit{and} \quad x \leq^{\mathbf{d}} x. \tag{6.3}$$

$$x = \mathbf{d}\text{-max}\, Y \quad \Rightarrow \quad x = \underline{\mathbf{d}}\text{-sup}\, Y. \tag{6.4}$$

If $\mathbf{d}$ is a distance and $Y \subseteq X$ is $\mathbf{d}$-final then

$$x = \mathbf{d}\text{-max}\, Y \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \mathbf{d}Y = \mathbf{d}x. \tag{6.5}$$

$$x = \mathbf{d}\text{-max}\, Y \quad \Leftarrow \quad x = \underline{\mathbf{d}}\text{-sup}\, Y \quad \textit{and} \quad y = \mathbf{d}\text{-max}\, Y. \tag{6.6}$$

Proof.

(6.3) If $Y\mathbf{d} = x\mathbf{d}$ and $x \leq^{\mathbf{d}} x$ then $Y\mathbf{d}x = x\mathbf{d}x = 0$, i.e. $Y \leq^{\mathbf{d}} x$ so $x = \mathbf{d}\text{-sup}\, Y$. If $Y \leq^{\mathbf{d}} x$ and $x\mathbf{d} \leq Y\mathbf{d}$ then $x\mathbf{d}x \leq Y\mathbf{d}x = 0$, i.e. $x \leq^{\mathbf{d}} x$. Also, as $\mathbf{d}$ is a distance, $Y \leq^{\mathbf{d}} x$ implies $Y\mathbf{d} \leq Y\mathbf{d}x + x\mathbf{d} = x\mathbf{d}$.

(6.4) If $\mathbf{d}Y \leq \mathbf{d}x$ then $Y\underline{\mathbf{d}} \geq x\underline{\mathbf{d}}$ as

$$\begin{aligned} Y\underline{\mathbf{d}}w &= \sup_{y\in Y, z\in X} (z\mathbf{d}w - z\mathbf{d}y)_+ \\ &= \sup_{z\in X} (z\mathbf{d}w - \inf_{y\in Y} z\mathbf{d}y)_+ \\ &= X(\mathbf{d}w - \mathbf{d}Y)_+ \\ &\geq X(\mathbf{d}w - \mathbf{d}x)_+ \\ &= x\underline{\mathbf{d}}w. \end{aligned}$$

Also $\underline{\mathbf{d}} \leq \mathbf{d}$, as $\mathbf{d}$ is a distance, so $Y \leq^{\mathbf{d}} x$ implies $Y \leq^{\underline{\mathbf{d}}} x$.

(6.5) If $\mathbf{d}Y = \mathbf{d}x$ then, as Y is $\mathbf{d}$-final, $0 = y\mathbf{d}Y = y\mathbf{d}x$, for all $y \in Y$, i.e. $Y \leq^{\mathbf{d}} x$ so $x = \mathbf{d}\text{-max}\, Y$. Conversely, as $\mathbf{d}$ is a distance, $Y \leq^{\mathbf{d}} x$ implies $\mathbf{d}x \leq \mathbf{d}Y + Y\mathbf{d}x = \mathbf{d}Y$.

(6.6) If $x = \underline{\mathbf{d}}\text{-sup}\, Y$ and $y = \mathbf{d}\text{-max}\, Y$ then $x\underline{\mathbf{d}}y \leq Y\underline{\mathbf{d}}y \leq Y\mathbf{d}y = 0$, as $\mathbf{d}$ is a distance. So $\mathbf{d}Y = \mathbf{d}y \leq \mathbf{d}x + x\underline{\mathbf{d}}y = \mathbf{d}x$. As Y is $\mathbf{d}$-final and $Y \leq^{\underline{\mathbf{d}}} x$, $Y\mathbf{d}x \leq Y(\mathbf{d}Y) + Y\underline{\mathbf{d}}x = 0$, i.e. $Y \leq^{\mathbf{d}} x$ too so $x = \mathbf{d}\text{-max}\, Y$. □

For any $\sqsubset \subseteq X \times X$, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} x = \sqsubset\text{-sup}\, Y \quad &\Leftrightarrow \quad Y \subseteq (\sqsubset x) \quad \text{and} \quad \bigcap_{y\in Y} (y \sqsubset) \subseteq (x \sqsubset). \\ x = \sqsubset\text{-max}\, Y \quad &\Leftrightarrow \quad Y \subseteq (\sqsubset x) \quad \text{and} \quad \bigcup_{y\in Y} (\sqsubset y) \supseteq (\sqsubset x). \end{aligned}$$

Thus if $\preceq$ is a partial order then $\preceq$-suprema and $\preceq$-maxima are suprema and maxima in the usual sense with respect to $\preceq$. Indeed, if $\sqsubset$ is antisymmetric and $x \sqsubset x = \sqsubset\text{-max}\, Y$ then, for some $y \in Y$, we have $x \sqsubset y \sqsubset x$ and hence $x = y$. Maxima are more interesting for non-reflexive relations, where they can be intuitively more like suprema, e.g. for any $Y \subseteq \mathbb{R}$,

$$x = <\text{-max}\, Y \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad x = \leq\text{-sup}\, Y \text{ and } x \notin Y.$$

We can also relate $\mathbf{d}$-suprema and $\mathbf{d}$-maxima to $\leq^{\mathbf{d}}$-suprema and $<^{\mathbf{d}}$-maxima, where $<^{\mathbf{d}} \subseteq \leq^{\mathbf{d}}$ is defined by $<^{\mathbf{d}} = \leq^{\mathbf{d}}/\Phi\underline{\mathbf{d}} = \bigcup_{\sqsubset\in\Phi\underline{\mathbf{d}}} \leq^{\mathbf{d}}/\sqsubset$, i.e.

$$x <^{\mathbf{d}} y \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \exists \epsilon > 0\ (y <^{\underline{\mathbf{d}}}_{\epsilon}) \subseteq (x \leq^{\mathbf{d}}).$$

In other words, $x <^{\mathbf{d}} y$ is saying y is in the $\underline{\mathbf{d}}^{\bullet}$-interior of $(x \leq^{\mathbf{d}})$, thus generalizing the relation considered in (Goubault-Larrecq 2013, Lemma 7.3.13).

Proposition 6.3. *For any $Y \subseteq X$,*

$$x = \mathbf{d}\text{-sup}\, Y \quad \Rightarrow \quad x = \leq^{\mathbf{d}}\text{-sup}\, Y. \tag{6.7}$$

$$x = \mathbf{d}\text{-sup}\, Y \quad \Leftarrow \quad x = \leq^{\mathbf{d}}\text{-sup}\, Y \qquad \textit{if } \leq^{\mathcal{P}\mathbf{d}} \circ \underline{\mathbf{d}} \leq \mathcal{P}\mathbf{d}. \tag{6.8}$$

If $\mathbf{d}$ is a distance then

$$x = \mathbf{d}\text{-max}\, Y \quad \Leftarrow \quad x = <^{\mathbf{d}}\text{-max}\, Y \qquad \textit{if } \overline{\mathbf{d}} \circ <^{\mathbf{d}} \leq \mathbf{d}. \tag{6.9}$$

If $\mathbf{d}$ *is a distance and* Y *is* $<^{\mathbf{d}}$*-final then*

$$x = \mathbf{d}\text{-}\max Y \quad \Rightarrow \quad x = <^{\mathbf{d}}\text{-}\max Y \qquad \text{if } <^{\overline{\mathbf{d}}} \circ \leq^{\mathbf{d}} \supseteq <^{\mathbf{d}}. \tag{6.10}$$

Proof.

(6.7) Multiplying $x\mathbf{d} \leq Y\mathbf{d}$ by ∞ yields $(x \leq^{\mathbf{d}}) \supseteq (Y \leq^{\mathbf{d}})$.

(6.8) Assume $x = \leq^{\mathbf{d}}\text{-}\sup Y \neq \mathbf{d}\text{-}\sup Y$ so $Y\mathbf{d}z < x\mathbf{d}z$, for some $z \in X$. As $(\leq^{\mathcal{P}\mathbf{d}} \circ \underline{\mathbf{d}}) \leq \mathcal{P}\mathbf{d}$, we have $w \in X$ such that $w\underline{\mathbf{d}}z < x\mathbf{d}z$ and $Y \leq^{\mathbf{d}} w$ and hence $x \leq^{\mathbf{d}} w$. Then $x\mathbf{d}z \leq x\mathbf{d}w + w\underline{\mathbf{d}}z < x\mathbf{d}z$, a contradiction.

(6.9) Assume $x = <^{\mathbf{d}}\text{-}\max Y \neq \mathbf{d}\text{-}\max Y$ so $z\mathbf{d}x < z\mathbf{d}Y$, for some $z \in X$. As $(\overline{\mathbf{d}} \circ <^{\mathbf{d}}) \leq \mathbf{d}$, we have $w <^{\mathbf{d}} x$ with $z\overline{\mathbf{d}}w < z\mathbf{d}Y$. This means that $w\mathbf{d}Y \geq z\mathbf{d}Y - z\overline{\mathbf{d}}w > 0$ so, for all $y \in Y$, $w \not\leq^{\mathbf{d}} y$ and hence $w \not<^{\mathbf{d}} y$, contradicting $x = <^{\mathbf{d}}\text{-}\max Y$.

(6.10) Assume $x = \mathbf{d}\text{-}\max Y$. As Y is $<^{\mathbf{d}}$-final, for any $y \in Y$, we have $z \in Y$ with $y <^{\mathbf{d}} z \leq^{\mathbf{d}} x$ and hence $y <^{\mathbf{d}} x$, as $z \leq^{\mathbf{d}} x$ implies $(\leq^{\mathbf{d}} x) \subseteq (\leq^{\mathbf{d}} z)$, i.e. $Y <^{\mathbf{d}} x$. Now take $z \in X$ with $z <^{\mathbf{d}} x$. We need to show that $z <^{\mathbf{d}} y$, for some $y \in Y$. Take $w \in X$ with $z <^{\overline{\mathbf{d}}} w \leq^{\mathbf{d}} x$, so $(w <^{\overline{\mathbf{d}}}_{\epsilon}) \subseteq (z \leq^{\overline{\mathbf{d}}})$, for some $\epsilon > 0$. As $w \leq^{\mathbf{d}} x = \mathbf{d}\text{-}\max Y$, we have $y \in Y$ such that $w\overline{\mathbf{d}}y \leq w\mathbf{d}y < \epsilon$ and hence $z \leq^{\overline{\mathbf{d}}} y$. As Y is $<^{\mathbf{d}}$-final, we have $y', y'' \in Y$ with $y \leq^{\mathbf{d}} y' <^{\mathbf{d}} y''$ so $z \leq^{\mathbf{d}} y' <^{\overline{\mathbf{d}}} y''$ and hence $z <^{\mathbf{d}} y''$. □

7. Completeness

Next we consider generalizations of metric and directed completeness.

Definition 7.1. *For any topology* $\mathcal{T}$ *on* X *and relation* $\mathcal{R} \subseteq X \times \mathcal{P}(X)$*, define*

$$\begin{aligned} &X \text{ is } \mathbf{d}\text{-}\mathcal{T}\text{-complete} && \Leftrightarrow && \forall \mathbf{d}\text{-Cauchy } (x_\lambda) \subseteq X\ \exists x \in X (x_\lambda \xrightarrow{\mathcal{T}} x).\\ &X \text{ is } \mathbf{d}\text{-}\mathcal{R}\text{-complete} && \Leftrightarrow && \forall\, \mathbf{d}\text{-directed } Y \subseteq X\ \exists x \mathcal{R} Y. \end{aligned}$$

When $\mathbf{d}$ is clear, we simply refer to $\mathcal{T}$-completeness and $\mathcal{R}$-completeness. The topologies and relations we are primarily interested in are $\mathbf{d}^\bullet_\circ$, $\mathbf{d}^\circ_\circ$, $\mathbf{d}$-sup and $\mathbf{d}$-max.

When $\mathbf{d}$ is a distance and $\mathcal{T} = \mathbf{d}^\bullet_\circ$ or $\mathbf{d}^\circ_\circ$, we can replace $\mathbf{d}$-Cauchy with $\mathbf{d}$-pre-Cauchy, by Proposition 3.3 (1) and Proposition 4.2. In the hemimetric case, these are usually called Smyth and Yoneda completeness – see (Goubault-Larrecq 2013, Definitions 7.2.1 and 7.4.1) – more precisely Proposition 4.1 and (4.11) yield

Figure 2. Hemimetric Case

$$\begin{array}{rccccc} & \text{Smyth complete} & \Leftrightarrow & \mathbf{d}^\bullet_\bullet\text{-complete} & \Leftrightarrow & \mathbf{d}^\bullet_\circ\text{-complete} \\ \Rightarrow & \text{Yoneda complete} & \Leftrightarrow & \mathbf{d}^\circ_\bullet\text{-complete} & \Leftrightarrow & \mathbf{d}^\circ_\circ\text{-complete.} \end{array}$$

If $\mathbf{d}$ is a metric, these are all equivalent to the usual notion of metric completeness.

On the other hand, for any poset $(X, \sqsubseteq)$

$$\text{directed complete} \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \sqsubseteq\text{-sup-complete} \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \sqsubseteq^\circ_\circ\text{-complete.}$$

If $\sqsubseteq$ is the lower reflexivization of some transitive $\sqsubset$ on X then, moreover,

$$\text{directed complete} \quad \Leftarrow \quad \sqsubset\text{-max-complete} \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \sqsubset^\bullet_\circ\text{-complete.}$$

But if $\mathbf{d}$ is a metric, every $\mathbf{d}$-directed subset contains at most 1 element, making X trivially $\mathbf{d}$-sup-complete and $\mathbf{d}$-max-complete. So unlike the topological notions of

completeness, the relational notions do not generalize metric completeness. Indeed, the topological notions are stronger (even for non-distance $\mathbf{d}$), as we now show.

Proposition 7.2.

(7.1) X *is* $\mathbf{d}^\circ_\circ$*-complete* $\Rightarrow$ X *is* $\mathbf{d}$-sup*-complete.*

(7.2) X *is* $\mathbf{d}^\bullet_\circ$*-complete* $\Rightarrow$ X *is* $\mathbf{d}$-max*-complete.*

Proof. Take $\mathbf{d}$-directed $Y \subseteq X$, so we have $(x_\lambda) \subseteq X$ with $Y \leq^{\mathbf{d}} (x_\lambda) \subseteq Y$, by (5.5). By (5.4) and Proposition 3.3 (1), we may assume (x_λ) is $\mathbf{d}$-Cauchy.

(7.1) If X is $\mathbf{d}^\circ_\circ$-complete then we have $x \in X$ with $x_\lambda \overset{\circ}{\underset{\circ}{\to}} x$. As $x_\lambda \overset{\circ}{\to} x$, (5.3) yields $Y \leq^{\mathbf{d}} x$. As $x_\lambda \overset{\circ}{\to} x$ and $(x_\lambda) \subseteq Y$, $x\mathbf{d} \leq (x_\lambda)\mathbf{d} \leq Y\mathbf{d}$.

(7.2) If X is $\mathbf{d}^\bullet_\circ$-complete then we have $x \in X$ with $x_\lambda \overset{\bullet}{\underset{\circ}{\to}} x$. As $x_\lambda \overset{\circ}{\to} x$, (5.3) yields $Y \leq^{\mathbf{d}} x$. As $x_\lambda \overset{\bullet}{\to} x$ and $(x_\lambda) \subseteq Y$, $\mathbf{d}x \geq \mathbf{d}(x_\lambda) \geq \mathbf{d}Y$. □

As in (Bice 2017), however, we can derive the topological from the relational notions under various interpolation assumptions. First we use these to turn nets into subsets and sequences, collecting their corollaries for completeness at the end.

Unless specifically stated otherwise, we assume for the rest of the paper that

$\mathbf{d}$ and $\mathbf{e}$ are distances on X.

First consider $\underline{\mathbf{d}} \circ \leq^{\mathbf{d}\mathcal{P}} \gtrapprox \mathbf{d}\mathcal{P}$. In terms of uniformities, this means

$$\forall \sqsubset \in \Phi^{\underline{\mathbf{d}}}\ \exists \prec \in \Phi^{\mathbf{d}}\ \forall x \in X\ \exists y \leq^{\mathbf{d}\mathcal{P}} (x \prec) \text{ with } x \sqsubset y.$$

Note this weakens $\mathbf{d} \circ \leq^{\mathbf{d}\mathcal{P}} \leq \mathbf{d}\mathcal{P}$ which is itself slightly weaker than saying 'every closed upper $\mathbf{d}$-ball has a $\leq^{\mathbf{d}}$-minimum'.

The following converse of (5.4) is based on (Bice 2017, Theorem 1).

Theorem 7.3. *If* $\underline{\mathbf{d}} \circ \leq^{\mathbf{d}\mathcal{P}} \gtrapprox \mathbf{d}\mathcal{P}$ *then*

$$(x_\lambda) \text{ is } \mathbf{d}\text{-pre-Cauchy} \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \exists <^{\mathbf{d}}\text{-directed } Y \leq^{\mathbf{d}} (x_\lambda) \leq^{\mathbf{d}} Y.$$

Proof. As $\underline{\mathbf{d}} \circ \leq^{\mathbf{d}\mathcal{P}} \gtrapprox \mathbf{d}\mathcal{P}$, $\lim_{r\to 0} \frac{\underline{\mathbf{d}}\circ\leq^{\mathbf{d}\mathcal{P}}}{\mathbf{d}\mathcal{P}}(r) = 0$ so we can define $r_n \downarrow 0$ with

$$\tfrac{\underline{\mathbf{d}}\circ\leq^{\mathbf{d}\mathcal{P}}}{\mathbf{d}\mathcal{P}}(2r_{n+1}) < r_n.$$

Take $\mathbf{d}$-pre-Cauchy $(x_\lambda) \subseteq X$. By Proposition 3.3 (1), we may assume that (x_λ) is $\mathbf{d}$-Cauchy. Define $f : \mathcal{F}(\Lambda) \to \Lambda$ recursively as follows. Let $f(\{\lambda\}) = \lambda$ and, given $F \in \mathcal{F}(\Lambda)$ with $|F| > 1$, take $f(F) \succ f(E)$, for all $E \subsetneqq F$, such that

$$\sup_{f(F)\prec\lambda} x_{f(F)}\mathbf{d}x_\lambda < r_{|F|}.$$

Now $x_{f(F)}(\underline{\mathbf{d}} \circ \leq^{\mathbf{d}\mathcal{P}})(x_{f(F)})^\bullet_{2r_{|F|}} \leq \frac{\underline{\mathbf{d}}\circ\leq^{\mathbf{d}\mathcal{P}}}{\mathbf{d}\mathcal{P}}(x_{f(F)}\mathbf{d}\mathcal{P}(x_{f(F)})^\bullet_{2r_{|F|}})$

$$= \tfrac{\underline{\mathbf{d}}\circ\leq^{\mathbf{d}\mathcal{P}}}{\mathbf{d}\mathcal{P}}(2r_{|F|}) < r_{|F|-1}.$$

Thus we have $y_F \leq^{\mathbf{d}\mathcal{P}} (x_{f(F)})^\bullet_{2r_{|F|}}$ satisfying $x_{f(F)}\underline{\mathbf{d}}y_F < r_{|F|-1}$. So if $F \subsetneqq G$ then we can take positive $\epsilon < r_{|G|-1} - x_{f(G)}\underline{\mathbf{d}}y_G$. If $y \in X$ satisfies $y_G\underline{\mathbf{d}}y < \epsilon$ then

$$x_{f(F)}\mathbf{d}y \leq x_{f(F)}\mathbf{d}x_{f(G)} + x_{f(G)}\underline{\mathbf{d}}y_G + y_G\underline{\mathbf{d}}y < r_{|F|} + r_{|G|-1} - \epsilon + \epsilon < 2r_{|F|}.$$

So $(y_G <^{\underline{\mathbf{d}}}_{\epsilon}) \subseteq (x_{f(F)})^\bullet_{2r_{|F|}} \subseteq (y_F \leq^{\mathbf{d}})$, i.e. $y_F <^{\mathbf{d}} y_G$ and so it follows that $Y = \{y_F : F \in \mathcal{F}(\Lambda)\}$ is $<^{\mathbf{d}}$-directed. Also $x_{f(F)}\mathbf{d}y_G \leq 2r_{|F|} \to 0$ so $(x_\lambda) \leq^{\mathbf{d}} Y$. And for $\lambda \succ f(F)$, $x_\lambda \in (x_{f(F)})^\bullet_{r_{|F|}} \subseteq (x_{f(F)})^\bullet_{2r_{|F|}}$ so $y_F \leq^{\mathbf{d}} x_\lambda$, i.e. $Y \leq^{\mathbf{d}} (x_\lambda)$. □

Next, consider the condition $\leq^{\mathcal{F}\mathbf{d}} \circ \overline{\mathbf{d}} \leq \mathcal{F}\mathbf{d}$. This weakens $\leq^{\mathcal{F}\mathbf{d}} \circ \mathbf{d} \leq \mathcal{F}\mathbf{d}$, which is equivalent to 'every open lower $\mathbf{d}$-ball is $\leq^{\mathbf{d}}$-directed'. This assumption yields the following result, based on (Bice 2017, Theorem 2).

Theorem 7.4. *If X is $\leq^{\mathbf{d}}$-$\mathbf{d}$-max-complete and $\leq^{\mathcal{F}\mathbf{d}} \circ \overline{\mathbf{d}} \leq \mathcal{F}\mathbf{d}$ then*

$$(x_\lambda) \text{ is } \mathbf{d}\text{-Cauchy} \qquad \Rightarrow \qquad \exists\, \underline{\mathbf{d}}^\vee\text{-Cauchy } (y_n)\ \mathbf{d}(x_\lambda) = \mathbf{d}(y_n).$$

Proof. Note $\leq^{\mathcal{F}\mathbf{d}} \circ \overline{\mathbf{d}} \leq \mathcal{F}\mathbf{d}$ is equivalent to $\frac{\leq^{\mathcal{F}\mathbf{d}} \circ \overline{\mathbf{d}}}{\mathcal{F}\mathbf{d}} \leq \mathbf{I}$, which is itself equivalent to $\frac{\leq^{\mathcal{F}\mathbf{d}} \circ \overline{\mathbf{d}}}{\mathcal{F}\mathbf{d}}[0,r) \subseteq [0,r)$, for all $r \in (0,\infty)$. In fact, it suffices that

$$0 \in \overline{\{r \in (0,\infty) : \tfrac{\leq^{\mathcal{F}\mathbf{d}} \circ \overline{\mathbf{d}}}{\mathcal{F}\mathbf{d}}[0,r) \subseteq [0,r)\}}, \tag{7.3}$$

so we have $r_n \downarrow 0$ with $\frac{\leq^{\mathcal{F}\mathbf{d}} \circ \overline{\mathbf{d}}}{\mathcal{F}\mathbf{d}}[0,r_n) \subseteq [0,r_n)$, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then we have positive $r_n^m \uparrow r_n$ with $\frac{\leq^{\mathcal{F}\mathbf{d}} \circ \overline{\mathbf{d}}}{\mathcal{F}\mathbf{d}}(r_n^m) < r_n^{m+1}$, for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Taking $\frac{\leq^{\mathcal{F}\mathbf{d}} \circ \overline{\mathbf{d}}}{\mathcal{F}\mathbf{d}}(r_n^0) = 0$, set

$$\epsilon_n^m = \tfrac{1}{2}(r_n^m - \tfrac{\leq^{\mathcal{F}\mathbf{d}} \circ \overline{\mathbf{d}}}{\mathcal{F}\mathbf{d}}(r_n^{m-1})).$$

Again take $\mathbf{d}$-Cauchy $(x_\lambda) \subseteq X$ and define $f : \mathcal{F}(\Lambda) \to \Lambda$ recursively so $f(\{\lambda\}) = \lambda$, for all $\lambda \in \Lambda$, $f(E) \prec f(F)$, for all $F \in \mathcal{F}(\Lambda)$ with $|F| > 1$ and all $E \subsetneq F$, and

$$\sup_{f(F) \prec \lambda} x_{f(F)} \mathbf{d} x_\lambda < \min_{1 \leq n < |F|} \epsilon_n^{|F|-n}.$$

For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\Lambda_n = \{F \in \mathcal{F}(\Lambda) : |F| > n\}$ and define $(y_F^n)_{F \in \Lambda_n}$ recursively as follows. When $|F| = n+1$, let $y_F^n = x_{f(F)}$ so if $F \subsetneq G$ then

$$y_F^n \mathbf{d} x_{f(G)} < \epsilon_n^1 < r_n^1.$$

When $|G| = n+2$, let $Y = \{y_F^n : F \subsetneq G \text{ and } |F| = n+1\}$ and take y_G^n with

$$Y \leq^{\mathbf{d}} y_G^n \quad \text{and} \quad y_G^n \overline{\mathbf{d}} x_{f(G)} < \tfrac{\leq^{\mathcal{F}\mathbf{d}} \circ \overline{\mathbf{d}}}{\mathcal{F}\mathbf{d}}(Y \mathbf{d} x_{f(G)}) + \epsilon_n^2 \leq \tfrac{\leq^{\mathcal{F}\mathbf{d}} \circ \overline{\mathbf{d}}}{\mathcal{F}\mathbf{d}}(r_n^1) + \epsilon_n^2.$$

As $x_{f(G)} \mathbf{d} x_{f(H)} < \epsilon_n^2$, whenever $G \subsetneq H$ and $|G| = n+2$,

$$y_G^n \mathbf{d} x_{f(H)} \leq y_G^n \overline{\mathbf{d}} x_{f(G)} + x_{f(G)} \mathbf{d} x_{f(H)} < \tfrac{\leq^{\mathcal{F}\mathbf{d}} \circ \overline{\mathbf{d}}}{\mathcal{F}\mathbf{d}}(r_n^1) + 2\epsilon_n^2 = r_n^2.$$

For $|H| = n+3$, take y_H^n with $y_G^n, x_{f(G)} \leq^{\mathbf{d}} y_H^n$, for $G \subsetneq H$ with $|G| = n+2$, and

$$y_H^n \mathbf{d} x_{f(H)} < \tfrac{\leq^{\mathcal{F}\mathbf{d}} \circ \overline{\mathbf{d}}}{\mathcal{F}\mathbf{d}}(r_n^2) + \epsilon_n^3.$$

Continuing in this way we obtain $\leq^{\mathbf{d}}$-increasing (y_F^n) with $y_F^n \mathbf{d} x_{f(G)} < r_n$ and $x_{f(F)} \leq^{\mathbf{d}} y_G^n$, for all $F \in \Lambda_{n+1}$ and $F \subsetneq G$.

As X is $\leq^{\mathbf{d}}$-$\mathbf{d}$-max-complete, we can take $y^n = \mathbf{d}\text{-max}\, y_F^n$ so $((x_\lambda)\mathbf{d})(y^n) = 0$ and hence $\mathbf{d}(y^n) \leq \mathbf{d}(x_\lambda)$. Also, for all $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $H \supsetneq G \supsetneq F \in \Lambda_{m \vee n+1}$,

$$y_F^m \mathbf{d} y^n \leq y_F^m \mathbf{d} y_H^n \leq y_F^m \mathbf{d} x_{f(G)} < r_m.$$

By (6.4), $y^n = \underline{\mathbf{d}}\text{-sup}\, y_F^n$ so $y^m \underline{\mathbf{d}} y^n \leq \lim_F y_F^m \underline{\mathbf{d}} y^n \leq r_m$ and hence $y^m \underline{\mathbf{d}}^\vee y^n \leq r_{m \wedge n}$. As $r_n \to 0$, this shows that (y^n) is $\underline{\mathbf{d}}^\vee$-Cauchy. Also,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{d}(x_\lambda) &= \lim_G \mathbf{d} x_{f(G)} \\
&\leq \liminf_n \liminf_F \liminf_G (\mathbf{d} y_F^n + y_F^n \mathbf{d} x_{f(G)}) \\
&\leq \liminf_n (\mathbf{d} y^n + r_n) \\
&= \mathbf{d}(y^n).
\end{aligned}$$

□

Non-symmetric distances are often obtained by composition $\mathbf{e} \circ \sqsubseteq$ of a symmetric distance $\mathbf{e}$ and a partial order $\sqsubseteq$. This leads us to consider conditions weakening $\mathbf{d} = \mathbf{d}^\vee \circ \leq^{\mathbf{d}}$ as in (Bice 2017, Theorem 3).

Theorem 7.5. *If X is $\mathbf{e}_\circ$-complete, $\mathbf{e} \circ \Phi^{\overline{\mathbf{d}}} \precapprox \mathbf{d}$ and $\underline{\mathbf{d}}, \overline{\mathbf{d}}^{\mathrm{op}} \precapprox \mathbf{e}$ then*

$$(x_\lambda) \text{ is } \mathbf{d}\text{-pre-Cauchy} \qquad \Leftrightarrow \qquad \exists\ \mathbf{d}\text{-directed } Y \leq^{\mathbf{d}} (x_\lambda) \leq^{\mathbf{d}} Y.$$

Proof. Again taking a subnet indexed by $\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)$ if necessary, we may assume we have nets $(s_\lambda), (t_\lambda) \subseteq (0, \infty)$ such that

$$\sup_{\lambda \prec \delta} x_\lambda \mathbf{d} x_\delta < s_\lambda \to 0.$$
$$\tfrac{\mathbf{e} \circ \Phi^{\overline{\mathbf{d}}}}{\mathbf{d}}(s_\lambda) < t_\lambda \to 0.$$

We define γ^n_λ and x^n_λ recursively so that

$$x^n_\lambda \overline{\mathbf{d}} x_{\gamma^n_\lambda} + \sup_{\gamma^n_\lambda \prec \delta} x_{\gamma^n_\lambda} \mathbf{d} x_\delta < s_{\gamma^n_\lambda}.$$

First set $\gamma^1_\lambda = \lambda$ and $x^1_\lambda = x_\lambda$. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, take $\gamma^{n+1}_\lambda \succ \gamma^n_\lambda$ with $\frac{\mathbf{e} \circ \Phi^{\overline{\mathbf{d}}}}{\mathbf{d}}(s_{\gamma^{n+1}_\lambda}), s_{\gamma^{n+1}_\lambda} < 2^{-n} t_\lambda$. As $x^n_\lambda \mathbf{d} x_{\gamma^{n+1}_\lambda} \leq x^n_\lambda \overline{\mathbf{d}} x_{\gamma^n_\lambda} + x_{\gamma^n_\lambda} \mathbf{d} x_{\gamma^{n+1}_\lambda} < s_{\gamma^n_\lambda}$,

$$x^n_\lambda (\mathbf{e} \circ \Phi^{\overline{\mathbf{d}}}) x_{\gamma^{n+1}_\lambda} \leq \tfrac{\mathbf{e} \circ \Phi^{\overline{\mathbf{d}}}}{\mathbf{d}}(x^n_\lambda \mathbf{d} x_{\gamma^{n+1}_\lambda}) \leq \tfrac{\mathbf{e} \circ \Phi^{\overline{\mathbf{d}}}}{\mathbf{d}}(s_{\gamma^n_\lambda}) < 2^{1-n} t_\lambda,$$

so we can take x^{n+1}_λ with $x^n_\lambda \mathbf{e} x^{n+1}_\lambda < 2^{1-n} t_\lambda$ and

$$x^{n+1}_\lambda \overline{\mathbf{d}} x_{\gamma^{n+1}_\lambda} < s_{\gamma^{n+1}_\lambda} - \sup_{\gamma^{n+1}_\lambda \prec \delta} x_{\gamma^{n+1}_\lambda} \mathbf{d} x_\delta.$$

Thus the recursion may continue.

For each λ, $x^n_\lambda \mathbf{e} x^{n+1}_\lambda < 2^{1-n} t_\lambda$ so (x^n_λ) is $\mathbf{e}$-Cauchy. By $\mathbf{e}_\circ$-completeness, we have $y_\lambda \in X$ such that $\lim_n x^n_\lambda \mathbf{e} y_\lambda = 0$ and hence $\lim_n y_\lambda \overline{\mathbf{d}} x^n_\lambda = 0$, as $\overline{\mathbf{d}}^{\mathrm{op}} \precapprox \mathbf{e}$. Now

$$\begin{aligned}
\limsup_\delta y_\lambda \mathbf{d} x_\delta &\leq \liminf_n \limsup_\delta (y_\lambda \overline{\mathbf{d}} x^n_\lambda + x^n_\lambda \overline{\mathbf{d}} x_{\gamma^n_\lambda} + x_{\gamma^n_\lambda} \mathbf{d} x_\delta) \\
&\leq \liminf_n (y_\lambda \overline{\mathbf{d}} x^n_\lambda + s_{\gamma^n_\lambda}) \\
&\leq \liminf_n (y_\lambda \overline{\mathbf{d}} x^n_\lambda + 2^{1-n} t_\lambda) \\
&= 0,
\end{aligned}$$

i.e. $Y \leq^{\mathbf{d}} (x_\lambda)$ for $Y = \{y_\lambda : \lambda \in \Lambda\}$.

As $x_\lambda = x^1_\lambda$, $x_\lambda \mathbf{e} y_\lambda \leq 2 t_\lambda \to 0$. Thus $x_\lambda \underline{\mathbf{d}} y_\lambda \to 0$, as $\underline{\mathbf{d}} \precapprox \mathbf{e}$. As (x_λ) is $\mathbf{d}$-Cauchy,

$$\limsup_\lambda \limsup_\delta x_\lambda \mathbf{d} y_\delta \leq \limsup_\lambda \limsup_\delta (x_\lambda \mathbf{d} x_\delta + x_\delta \underline{\mathbf{d}} y_\delta) = 0,$$

i.e. $(x_\lambda) \leq^{\mathbf{d}} Y$. Thus Y is $\mathbf{d}$-directed, by (5.5). □

Replacing $\Phi^{\overline{\mathbf{d}}}$ with $\Phi^{\mathbf{d}}$ above allows us to obtain $\leq^{\mathbf{d}}$-directed subsets from $\mathbf{d}$-pre-Cauchy sequences (rather than $\mathbf{d}$-directed subsets from $\mathbf{d}$-pre-Cauchy nets).

Theorem 7.6. *If X is $\mathbf{e}_\circ$-complete, $\mathbf{e} \circ \Phi^{\mathbf{d}} \precapprox \mathbf{d}$ and $\underline{\mathbf{d}}, \overline{\mathbf{d}}^{\mathrm{op}} \precapprox \mathbf{e}$ then*

$$(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \text{ is } \mathbf{d}\text{-pre-Cauchy} \qquad \Leftrightarrow \qquad \exists\ \leq^{\mathbf{d}}\text{-directed } Y \leq^{\mathbf{d}} (x_n) \leq^{\mathbf{d}} Y.$$

We omit the proof, which is essentially the same as (Bice 2017, Theorem 3) (which, incidentally, also shows that $\mathbf{e} \circ \Phi^{\mathbf{d}} = \mathbf{e} \circ \leq^{\mathbf{d}}$ in this situation).

Corollary 7.7. *X is $\mathbf{d}^\bullet_\circ$-complete if $\mathbf{d}$ and $\mathbf{e}$ satisfy any of*

(7.4) $\underline{\mathbf{d}} \circ \leq^{\mathbf{d}\mathcal{P}} \precapprox \mathbf{d}\mathcal{P}$ *and* X *is* $<^{\mathbf{d}}$-$\mathbf{d}$-max-*complete.*

(7.5) $\leq^{\mathcal{F}\mathbf{d}} \circ \overline{\mathbf{d}} \leq \mathcal{F}\mathbf{d}$, $\overline{\mathbf{d}} \leq \underline{\mathbf{d}}$, X *is* $\leq^{\mathbf{d}}$-$\mathbf{d}$-max-*complete and* $\underline{\mathbf{d}}^\vee_\circ$-*complete.*

(7.6) $\mathbf{e} \circ \Phi^{\overline{\mathbf{d}}} \precapprox \mathbf{d}$, $\underline{\mathbf{d}}, \overline{\mathbf{d}}^{\mathrm{op}} \precapprox \mathbf{e}$, X *is* ($\mathbf{d}$-)$\mathbf{d}$-max-*complete and* $\mathbf{e}_\circ$-*complete.*

(7.7) $\mathbf{e} \circ \Phi^{\mathbf{d}} \precapprox \mathbf{d}$, $\underline{\mathbf{d}}, \overline{\mathbf{d}}^{\mathrm{op}} \precapprox \mathbf{e}$, X *is* $\leq^{\mathbf{d}}$-$\mathbf{d}$-max-*complete,* $\mathbf{e}_\circ$-*complete and* $\overline{\mathbf{d}}^\bullet_\bullet$-*separable.*

Proof. Take $\mathbf{d}$-Cauchy (x_λ).

(7.4) By Theorem 7.3, we have $<^{\mathbf{d}}$-directed Y such that $Y \leq^{\mathbf{d}} (x_\lambda) \leq^{\mathbf{d}} Y$ and hence $\mathbf{d}Y = \mathbf{d}(x_\lambda)$. By $<^{\mathbf{d}}$-$\mathbf{d}$-max-completeness we have $x \in X$ with $\mathbf{d}x = \mathbf{d}Y = \mathbf{d}(x_\lambda)$, i.e. $x_\lambda \xrightarrow[\circ]{\bullet} x$. Thus X is $\mathbf{d}^\bullet_\circ$-complete.

(7.5) By Theorem 7.4, we have $\mathbf{d}^\vee$-Cauchy (y_n) with $\mathbf{d}(x_\lambda) = \mathbf{d}(y_n)$. By $\underline{\mathbf{d}}^\vee_\circ$-completeness, we have $x \in X$ with $y_n \underline{\mathbf{d}}^\vee x \to 0$ and hence $(x_\lambda)\mathbf{d}x = (y_n)\mathbf{d}x = 0$, i.e. $x_\lambda \xrightarrow[\circ]{} x$. As $\overline{\mathbf{d}} \leq \underline{\mathbf{d}}$,

$$\mathbf{d}(x_\lambda) = \mathbf{d}(y_n) = \overline{\mathbf{d}}(y_n) \leq \underline{\mathbf{d}}(y_n) = \underline{\mathbf{d}}x \leq \mathbf{d}x,$$

by (4.8), i.e. $x_\lambda \xrightarrow{\bullet} x$ and hence $x_\lambda \xrightarrow[\circ]{\bullet} x$. Thus X is $\mathbf{d}^\bullet_\circ$-complete.

(7.6) By Theorem 7.5, we have $\mathbf{d}$-directed Y such that $Y \leq^{\mathbf{d}} (x_\lambda) \leq^{\mathbf{d}} Y$ and hence $\mathbf{d}Y = \mathbf{d}(x_\lambda)$. By $\mathbf{d}$-max-completeness, we have $x \in X$ with $\mathbf{d}x = \mathbf{d}Y = \mathbf{d}(x_\lambda)$, i.e. $x_\lambda \xrightarrow[\circ]{\bullet} x$. Thus X is $\mathbf{d}^\bullet_\circ$-complete.

(7.7) By Theorem 7.5, we have $\mathbf{d}$-directed Y such that $Y \leq^{\mathbf{d}} (x_\lambda) \leq^{\mathbf{d}} Y$. By (5.6), we have $(x'_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ with $Y \leq^{\mathbf{d}} (x'_n) \subseteq Y$. By Theorem 7.6, we have $\leq^{\mathbf{d}}$-directed Y' with $Y' \leq^{\mathbf{d}} (x'_n) \leq^{\mathbf{d}} Y'$ and hence $\mathbf{d}Y' = \mathbf{d}(x_\lambda)$. By $\mathbf{d}$-max-completeness, we have $x \in X$ with $\mathbf{d}x = \mathbf{d}Y' = \mathbf{d}(x_\lambda)$, i.e. $x_\lambda \xrightarrow[\circ]{\bullet} x$. Thus X is $\mathbf{d}^\bullet_\circ$-complete. □

8. Continuity

Recall that a poset $(X, \leq)$ is said to be *continuous* if every $x \in X$ is the $\leq$-supremum of a $\ll$-directed subset, where $\ll$ is the way-below relation defined from $\leq$ – see (Gierz et al. 2003, Definition I-1.6). In terms of Definition 8.1, this becomes

$$\begin{aligned} X \text{ is a continuous poset} \quad &\Leftrightarrow \quad X \text{ is } \ll\text{-}\leq\text{-sup-continuous} \\ &\Leftrightarrow \quad X \text{ is } \ll\text{-}\leq^\circ_\circ\text{-continuous.} \end{aligned}$$

Definition 8.1. *For any topology $\mathcal{T}$ on X and relation $\mathcal{R} \subseteq X \times \mathcal{P}(X)$, define*

$$\begin{aligned} X \textit{ is } \mathbf{d}\text{-}\mathcal{T}\text{-continuous} \quad &\Leftrightarrow \quad \forall x \in X\ \exists \mathbf{d}\textit{-Cauchy } (x_\lambda) \subseteq X\ (x_\lambda \xrightarrow{\mathcal{T}} x). \\ X \textit{ is } \mathbf{d}\text{-}\mathcal{R}\text{-continuous} \quad &\Leftrightarrow \quad \forall x \in X\ \exists \mathbf{d}\textit{-directed } Y \subseteq X\ (x \mathcal{R} Y). \end{aligned}$$

Again, we drop $\mathbf{d}$ when it is clear from the context.

Note these notions trivialize when $\leq^{\mathbf{d}}$ is reflexive. Indeed, if $x \leq^{\mathbf{d}} x$ then any constant x-valued net is $\mathbf{d}$-Cauchy, with limit x for any topology $\mathcal{T}$. Likewise, if $\mathcal{R}$ is $\mathbf{d}$-sup or $\mathbf{d}$-max then $x\mathcal{R}\{x\}$ whenever $x \leq^{\mathbf{d}} x$. So $\mathbf{d}^\circ_\circ$-continuity and $\mathbf{d}$-sup-continuity are equivalent to the reflexivity of $\leq^{\mathbf{d}}$, by (4.12) and (6.3).

Thus we primarily interested in $\mathbf{d}^\bullet_\circ$-continuity and $\mathbf{d}$-max-continuity. Indeed, classical domains can also be characterized by $\ll^\bullet_\circ$-continuity/$\ll$-max-continuity rather than the more standard $\ll$-$\leq^\circ_\circ$-continuity/$\ll$-$\leq$-sup-continuity mentioned above (see Theorem 9.3/Theorem 9.5 below).

Proposition 8.2.

$$X \text{ is } \mathbf{d}\text{-max-continuous} \quad \Rightarrow \quad X \text{ is } \mathbf{d}^{\bullet}_{\circ}\text{-continuous.} \tag{8.1}$$

Proof. For any $x \in X$, take $\mathbf{d}$-directed $Y \subseteq X$ with $x = \mathbf{d}\text{-max}\, Y$. As in the proof of Proposition 7.2, we have $\mathbf{d}$-Cauchy (x_λ) with $Y \leq^{\mathbf{d}} (x_\lambda) \subseteq Y$. As $Y \leq^{\mathbf{d}} x$, $(x_\lambda)\mathbf{d}x \leq Y\mathbf{d}x = 0$ so $x_\lambda \underset{\circ}{\to} x$, by (4.11). Also $Y \leq^{\mathbf{d}} (x_\lambda)$ means $Y(\mathbf{d}(x_\lambda)) = 0$ so $\mathbf{d}(x_\lambda) \leq \mathbf{d}Y + Y(\mathbf{d}(x_\lambda)) = \mathbf{d}Y \leq \mathbf{d}x$, i.e. $x_\lambda \overset{\bullet}{\to} x$. □

Additional assumptions also yield the converse. First we characterize $\mathbf{d}^{\bullet}_{\circ}$-continuity.

Theorem 8.3. *The following are equivalent.*

(1) X *is* $\mathbf{d}^{\bullet}_{\circ}$*-continuous.*
(2) $\mathcal{F}\mathbf{d} \circ \Phi^{\mathbf{d}} \leq \mathcal{F}\mathbf{d}$.
(3) $\mathcal{F}\mathbf{d} \circ \mathbf{d} \precapprox \mathcal{F}\mathbf{d}$ *and* $\mathbf{d} \circ \Phi^{\mathbf{d}} \leq \mathbf{d}$.
(4) For any $\underline{\mathbf{d}}$*-Cauchy* $(x_\lambda) \subseteq X$*, we have* $\mathbf{d}$*-Cauchy* $(y_\gamma) \subseteq X$ *with*

$$(x_\lambda)\underline{\mathbf{d}} = (y_\gamma)\underline{\mathbf{d}} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \mathbf{d}(x_\lambda) = \mathbf{d}(y_\gamma).$$

Proof.

(4)⇒(1) Take (x_λ) to be a constant net.

(1)⇒(2) If $x_\lambda \overset{\bullet}{\underset{\circ}{\to}} x$ then, for any $y \in X$, we have $y\mathbf{d}x = \lim y\mathbf{d}x_\lambda$. If (x_λ) is also $\mathbf{d}$-Cauchy then $x_\lambda \mathbf{d} x \to 0$. Thus, for any $F \in \mathcal{F}(X)$ and $\epsilon > 0$, we have some x_λ with $F\mathbf{d}x_\lambda < F\mathbf{d}x + \epsilon$ and $x_\lambda \mathbf{d} x < \epsilon$, i.e. $\mathcal{F}\mathbf{d} \circ \Phi^{\mathbf{d}} \leq \mathcal{F}\mathbf{d}$.

(2)⇒(3) Assuming (2), we immediately have $\mathbf{d} \circ \Phi^{\mathbf{d}} \leq \mathbf{d}$. Also $\mathcal{F}\mathbf{d} \circ \mathbf{d} \precapprox \mathcal{F}\mathbf{d}$, as

$$\mathcal{F}\mathbf{d} \circ \mathbf{d} \leq \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{F}\mathbf{d} \circ n\mathbf{d} = \mathcal{F}\mathbf{d} \circ \Phi^{\mathbf{d}} \leq \mathcal{F}\mathbf{d}.$$

(3)⇒(4) Assume (3) and take $\epsilon > 0$, $F \in \mathcal{F}(X)$ and $x \in X$. We claim that we have $z <^{\mathbf{d}}_{\epsilon} x$ with $y\mathbf{d}z < y\mathbf{d}x + \epsilon$, for all $y \in F$. Indeed, for each $y \in F$, we have $y' \in X$ such that $y\mathbf{d}y' \leq y\mathbf{d}x + \frac{1}{2}\epsilon$ and $\frac{\mathcal{F}\mathbf{d}\circ\mathbf{d}}{\mathcal{F}\mathbf{d}}(y'\mathbf{d}x) < \frac{1}{2}\epsilon$. Thus $F'(\mathcal{F}\mathbf{d} \circ \mathbf{d})x \leq \frac{\mathcal{F}\mathbf{d}\circ\mathbf{d}}{\mathcal{F}\mathbf{d}}(F'\mathbf{d}x) < \frac{1}{2}\epsilon$, where $F' = \{y' : y \in F\}$, i.e. we have $z \in X$ with $F'\mathbf{d}z + z\mathbf{d}x < \frac{1}{2}\epsilon$, so $F'\mathbf{d}z < \frac{1}{2}\epsilon$ and $z <^{\mathbf{d}}_{\epsilon} x$. By (△), $y\mathbf{d}z \leq y\mathbf{d}y' + y'\mathbf{d}z \leq y\mathbf{d}x + \epsilon$, for all $y \in F$.

Now take $\underline{\mathbf{d}}$-Cauchy $(x_\lambda)_{\lambda\in\Lambda} \subseteq X$ and consider $\Gamma = \mathcal{F}(X) \times \Lambda \times (0, \infty)$ directed by $\subseteq \times \prec \times >$. By the claim, for every $(F, \lambda, \epsilon) \in \Gamma$, we have $y_{(F,\lambda,\epsilon)} \in X$ with $y\mathbf{d}y_{(F,\lambda,\epsilon)} < y\mathbf{d}x_\lambda + \epsilon$, for all $y \in F$, and $y_{(F,\lambda,\epsilon)}\mathbf{d}x_\lambda < \epsilon$. This implies $\mathbf{d}(y_\gamma) \leq \mathbf{d}(x_\lambda)$ and $\mathbf{d}(x_\lambda) \leq \mathbf{d}(y_\gamma)$ respectively, as $\mathbf{d}$ is a distance. Thus, by (3.3),

$$(x_\lambda)\underline{\mathbf{d}}y = X(\mathbf{d}y - \mathbf{d}(x_\lambda))_+ = X(\mathbf{d}y - \mathbf{d}(y_\gamma))_+ = (y_\gamma)\underline{\mathbf{d}}y.$$

To see that (y_γ) is $\mathbf{d}$-pre-Cauchy, note that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\limsup_{(F,\lambda,\epsilon)\in\Gamma}\limsup_{(G,\beta,\delta)\in\Gamma} y_{(F,\lambda,\epsilon)}\mathbf{d}y_{(G,\beta,\delta)}\\
=\;&\limsup_{(F,\lambda,\epsilon)\in\Gamma}\limsup_{\substack{(G,\beta,\delta)\in\Gamma\\ y_{(F,\lambda,\epsilon)}\in G}} y_{(F,\lambda,\epsilon)}\mathbf{d}y_{(G,\beta,\delta)}\\
\leq\;&\limsup_{(F,\lambda,\epsilon)\in\Gamma}\limsup_{\substack{(G,\beta,\delta)\in\Gamma\\ y_{(F,\lambda,\epsilon)}\in G}} y_{(F,\lambda,\epsilon)}\mathbf{d}x_\beta+\delta\\
=\;&\limsup_{(F,\lambda,\epsilon)\in\Gamma}\limsup_{\beta\in\Lambda} y_{(F,\lambda,\epsilon)}\mathbf{d}x_\beta\\
\leq\;&\limsup_{(F,\lambda,\epsilon)\in\Gamma}\limsup_{\beta\in\Lambda}(y_{(F,\lambda,\epsilon)}\mathbf{d}x_\lambda+x_\lambda\underline{\mathbf{d}}x_\beta)\\
\leq\;&\limsup_{(F,\lambda,\epsilon)\in\Gamma}(\epsilon+\limsup_{\beta\in\Lambda}x_\lambda\underline{\mathbf{d}}x_\beta)\\
=\;&\limsup_{\lambda\in\Lambda}\limsup_{\beta\in\Lambda}x_\lambda\underline{\mathbf{d}}x_\beta\\
=\;&0,\qquad \text{as } (x_\lambda) \text{ is } \underline{\mathbf{d}}\text{(-pre)-Cauchy.}
\end{aligned}$$

By Proposition 3.3 (1), we can replace (y_γ) with a $\mathbf{d}$-Cauchy subnet. □

Next we characterize $\mathbf{d}$-max-continuity.

Theorem 8.4. *The following are equivalent.*

(1) X *is* $\mathbf{d}$-max-*continuous.*
(2) $\mathcal{F}\mathbf{d}\circ\leq^{\mathbf{d}}\leq\mathcal{F}\mathbf{d}$.
(3) $\mathbf{d}\circ\leq^{\mathbf{d}}\leq\mathbf{d}$ *and* $\leq^{\mathcal{F}\mathbf{d}}\subseteq\Phi^{\mathcal{F}\mathbf{d}}\circ\leq^{\mathbf{d}}$.
(4) $\mathbf{d}\circ\leq^{\mathbf{d}}\precapprox\mathbf{d}$ *and* X *is* $\mathbf{d}^\bullet_\circ$-*continuous.*
(5) For any $\underline{\mathbf{d}}$-*directed* $Y\subseteq X$, *we have* $\mathbf{d}$-*directed* $Z\subseteq X$ *with*

$$Y\underline{\mathbf{d}}=Z\underline{\mathbf{d}}\qquad\text{and}\qquad\mathbf{d}Y=\mathbf{d}Z.$$

Proof.

(5)⇒(1) Take $Y=\{x\}$, for any $x\in X$.
(1)⇒(2) By (1), for any $x\in X$, we have $\mathbf{d}$-directed $Y\subseteq X$ with $x=\mathbf{d}\text{-max}\,Y$. Thus, for any $F\in\mathcal{F}(X)$, $F(\mathcal{F}\mathbf{d}\circ\leq^{\mathbf{d}})x\leq(F\mathbf{d})Y=F(\mathbf{d}Y)=F\mathbf{d}x$.
(2)⇒(3) By (2), we immediately have $\mathbf{d}\circ\leq^{\mathbf{d}}\leq\mathbf{d}$ and $\mathcal{F}\mathbf{d}\circ\leq^{\mathbf{d}}\leq\leq^{\mathcal{F}\mathbf{d}}$ and hence $\Phi^{\mathcal{F}\mathbf{d}}\circ\leq^{\mathbf{d}}=\sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}}n(\mathcal{F}\mathbf{d}\circ\leq^{\mathbf{d}})\leq\leq^{\mathcal{F}\mathbf{d}}$, in other words $\leq^{\mathcal{F}\mathbf{d}}\subseteq\Phi^{\mathcal{F}\mathbf{d}}\circ\leq^{\mathbf{d}}$.
(1)⇒(4) Immediate from (1)⇒(2)⇒(3) and (8.1).
(4)⇒(2) Assuming $\mathbf{d}\circ\leq^{\mathbf{d}}\precapprox\mathbf{d}$ and Theorem 8.3 (2), for any $F\in\mathcal{F}(X)$, $x\in X$ and $\epsilon>0$, we have $z\in X$ with $F\mathbf{d}z\leq F\mathbf{d}x+\epsilon$ and $\frac{\mathbf{d}\circ\leq^{\mathbf{d}}}{\mathbf{d}}(z\mathbf{d}x)<\epsilon$. Thus we have $y\leq^{\mathbf{d}}x$ with $z\mathbf{d}y<\epsilon$ and hence $F\mathbf{d}y\leq F\mathbf{d}x+2\epsilon$.
(3)⇒(5) Assume (3) and let $Z=\bigcup_{x\in Y}(\leq^{\mathbf{d}}x)$, so $\mathbf{d}Y\leq\mathbf{d}Z$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{d}\circ\leq^{\mathbf{d}}\leq\mathbf{d}\qquad&\Leftrightarrow\qquad x=\mathbf{d}\text{-max}\,(\leq^{\mathbf{d}}x)\text{, for all } x\in X.\\
\leq^{\mathcal{F}\mathbf{d}}\subseteq\Phi^{\mathcal{F}\mathbf{d}}\circ\leq^{\mathbf{d}}\qquad&\Leftrightarrow\qquad(\leq^{\mathbf{d}}x)\text{ is }\mathbf{d}\text{-directed, for all } x\in X.
\end{aligned}$$

So $\mathbf{d}Z=\inf_{x\in Y}\mathbf{d}(\leq^{\mathbf{d}}x)\leq\inf_{x\in Y}\mathbf{d}x=\mathbf{d}Y$. Thus, by the proof of (6.4), $Y\underline{\mathbf{d}}w=X(\mathbf{d}w-\mathbf{d}Y)_+=X(\mathbf{d}w-\mathbf{d}Z)_+=Z\underline{\mathbf{d}}w$.

For any $F \in \mathcal{F}(Z)$, we have $F' \in \mathcal{F}(Y)$ with $F \subseteq \bigcup_{x\in F'}(\leq^{\mathbf{d}} x)$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned}(F\mathbf{d})Z &= \inf_{x\in Y}(F\mathbf{d})(\leq^{\mathbf{d}} x) = \inf_{x\in Y} F(\mathbf{d}(\leq^{\mathbf{d}} x)) \leq \inf_{x\in Y} F\mathbf{d}x \leq \inf_{x\in Y} F(\mathbf{d}\circ\underline{\mathbf{d}})x\\ &\leq \inf_{x\in Y}\sup_{z\in F}\inf_{y\in F'}(z\mathbf{d}y + y\underline{\mathbf{d}}x) \leq \inf_{x\in Y}\sup_{z\in F}(z\mathbf{d}F' + F'\underline{\mathbf{d}}x) = (F'\underline{\mathbf{d}})Y = 0,\end{aligned}$$

so Z is $\mathbf{d}$-directed. □

In particular, for transitive $\sqsubset \subseteq X \times X$,

$$X \text{ is } \sqsubset^{\bullet}_{\circ}\text{-continuous} \quad\Leftrightarrow\quad X \text{ is } \sqsubset\text{-max-continuous} \quad\Leftrightarrow\quad \mathcal{F}\sqsubset \subseteq \mathcal{F}\sqsubset\circ\sqsubset .$$

This last interpolation condition is the defining property of an 'abstract basis' – see (Goubault-Larrecq 2013, Lemma 5.1.32) or (Gierz et al. 2003, Definition III-4.15).

As before in Corollary 7.7, under certain interpolation conditions we can derive $\mathbf{d}$-max-continuity (and slightly stronger continuity notions) from $\mathbf{d}^{\bullet}_{\circ}$-continuity.

Corollary 8.5. *Assume X is $\mathbf{d}^{\bullet}_{\circ}$-continuous.*

(1) X is $<^{\mathbf{d}}$-$\mathbf{d}$-max-continuous if $\underline{\mathbf{d}}\circ\leq^{\mathbf{d}\mathcal{P}} \precapprox \mathbf{d}\mathcal{P}$.

(2) X is ($\mathbf{d}$-)$\mathbf{d}$-max-continuous if $\mathbf{d}\circ\leq^{\mathbf{d}} \precapprox \mathbf{d}$.

(3) X is ($\mathbf{d}$-)$\mathbf{d}$-max-continuous if $\mathbf{e}\circ\Phi^{\overline{\mathbf{d}}} \precapprox \mathbf{d}$, $\underline{\mathbf{d}}\vee\overline{\mathbf{d}}^{\mathrm{op}} \precapprox \mathbf{e}$, X is $\mathbf{e}_{\circ}$-complete.

(4) X is $\leq^{\mathbf{d}}$-$\mathbf{d}$-max-continuous if $\mathbf{e}\circ\Phi^{\mathbf{d}} \precapprox \mathbf{d}$, $\underline{\mathbf{d}}\vee\overline{\mathbf{d}}^{\mathrm{op}} \precapprox \mathbf{e}$, X is $\mathbf{e}_{\circ}$-complete and $\overline{\mathbf{d}}^{\bullet}_{\bullet}$-separable.

Proof. Again (1), (3) and (4) follow from Theorem 7.3, Theorem 7.5 and Theorem 7.6 respectively – (2) is Theorem 8.4 (4), stated here again for comparison. □

Next we consider bases – see (Goubault-Larrecq 2013) Definition 5.1.22.

Definition 8.6. *For any $B \subseteq X$, topology $\mathcal{T}$ on X and $\mathcal{R} \subseteq X \times \mathcal{P}(X)$, define*

$$\begin{aligned}B \text{ is a } \mathbf{d}\text{-}\mathcal{T}\text{-basis} &\quad\Leftrightarrow\quad \forall x \in X\ \exists \mathbf{d}\text{-Cauchy } (x_\lambda) \subseteq B\ (x_\lambda \xrightarrow{\mathcal{T}} x).\\ B \text{ is a } \mathbf{d}\text{-}\mathcal{R}\text{-basis} &\quad\Leftrightarrow\quad \forall x \in X\ \exists \mathbf{d}\text{-directed } Y \subseteq B\ (x\mathcal{R}Y).\end{aligned}$$

This is the same as Definition 8.1, just with B replacing X. Bases can likewise be characterized as in Theorem 8.3 and Theorem 8.4, just with interpolation in B rather than X. In fact, weaker conditions suffice for continuous X.

Proposition 8.7. *If X is $\mathbf{d}^{\bullet}_{\circ}$-continuous then, for any $B \subseteq X$,*

$$B \text{ is a } \mathbf{d}^{\bullet}_{\circ}\text{-basis} \quad\Leftrightarrow\quad \mathbf{d}\circ B\circ\mathbf{d} \precapprox \mathbf{d} \quad\Leftrightarrow\quad B \text{ is } \mathbf{d}^{\bullet}_{\bullet}\text{-dense.}$$

Proof. If B is a is $\mathbf{d}^{\bullet}_{\circ}$-basis then, as in Theorem 8.3, we have $\mathcal{F}\mathbf{d}\circ B\circ\Phi^{\mathbf{d}} \leq \mathcal{F}\mathbf{d}$ which certainly implies $\mathbf{d}\circ B\circ\mathbf{d} \precapprox \mathbf{d}$. Conversely, if $\mathbf{d}\circ B\circ\mathbf{d} \precapprox \mathbf{d}$ then, for all $\epsilon > 0$, we have $\delta > 0$ such that $<^{\mathbf{d}}_{\delta} \subseteq <^{\mathbf{d}}_{\epsilon}\circ B\circ <^{\mathbf{d}}_{\epsilon}$ and hence

$$\mathcal{F}\mathbf{d} \;\geq\; \mathcal{F}\mathbf{d}\circ\Phi^{\mathbf{d}} \;\geq\; \mathcal{F}\mathbf{d}\circ <^{\mathbf{d}}_{\delta} \geq\; \mathcal{F}\mathbf{d}\circ <^{\mathbf{d}}_{\epsilon}\circ B\circ <^{\mathbf{d}}_{\epsilon} .$$

As $\epsilon > 0$ was arbitrary, $\mathcal{F}\mathbf{d} \geq \mathcal{F}\mathbf{d}\circ B\circ\Phi^{\mathbf{d}}$ so B is a $\mathbf{d}^{\bullet}_{\circ}$-basis.

Assume again that B is a $\mathbf{d}^{\bullet}_{\circ}$-basis and take non-empty $\mathbf{d}^{\bullet}_{\bullet}$-open $O \subseteq X$. So for any $x \in O$, we have $y_1, \ldots, y_m, z_1, \ldots, z_n \in X$ and $r_1, \ldots, r_m, s_1, \ldots, s_n > 0$ with

$$x \in N = \bigcap_{1\leq j\leq m}(y_j)^{\bullet}_{r_j} \cap \bigcap_{1\leq k\leq n}(z_k)^{s_k}_{\bullet} \subseteq O.$$

As in the proof of Theorem 8.3 (3)⇒(4) we then have $b \in B$ with $y_j\mathbf{d}b < r_j$, for $1 \leq j \leq m$, and $b\mathbf{d}x < \min_{1\leq k\leq n} s_k - x\mathbf{d}z_k$. Thus $x \in N \subseteq O$, i.e. B is $\mathbf{d}^{\bullet}_{\bullet}$-dense.

Conversely, if B is $\mathbf{d}^{\bullet}_{\bullet}$-dense then $\mathbf{d}\circ B\circ\mathbf{d} = \mathbf{d}\circ\mathbf{d} \leq \mathbf{d}$, by $\mathbf{d}^{\bullet}_{\circ}$-continuity. □

Proposition 8.8. *If $B \subseteq X$ is a $\mathbf{d}^{\bullet}_{\circ}$-basis then $\overline{\mathbf{d}|_B} = \overline{\mathbf{d}}|_B$ and $\underline{\mathbf{d}|_B} = \underline{\mathbf{d}}|_B$.*

Proof. Follows from Proposition 2.3, as $\mathcal{F}\mathbf{d} \circ B \circ \Phi^{\mathbf{d}} \leq \mathbf{d}$ implies $\mathbf{d} \circ B \circ \mathbf{d} \leq \mathbf{d}$. □

Letting $\mathbf{d}_\infty = (\leq^{\mathbf{d}})_\bullet = (\infty\mathbf{d})_\bullet$ we have the following analogous characterization of $\mathbf{d}$-max-bases. We omit the proof, which is essentially the same as above.

Proposition 8.9. *If X is $\mathbf{d}$-max-continuous then, for $B \subseteq X$,*

$$B \text{ is a } \mathbf{d}\text{-max-basis} \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \mathbf{d} \circ B \circ \leq^{\mathbf{d}} \precapprox \mathbf{d} \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad B \text{ is } \mathbf{d}^{\bullet}_{\infty}\text{-dense.}$$

9. Way-Below Distances

Next we consider distance analogs of the way-below relation.

Definition 9.1. *For any topology $\mathcal{T}$ on X and relation $\mathcal{R} \subseteq X \times \mathcal{P}(X)$, define*

$$\mathcal{T}\mathbf{d}(x,y) = \sup\{(x\mathbf{d}(z_\lambda) - y\mathbf{d}z)_+ : (z_\lambda) \text{ is } \mathbf{d}\text{-Cauchy and } z_\lambda \xrightarrow{\mathcal{T}} z\}. \tag{9.1}$$

$$\mathcal{R}\mathbf{d}(x,y) = \sup\{(x\mathbf{d}Z - y\mathbf{d}z)_+ : Z \text{ is } \mathbf{d}\text{-directed and } z\mathcal{R}Z\}. \tag{9.2}$$

Again, we abbreviate duplicate distance symbols, e.g. $\mathbf{d}^{\circ}_{\circ}\mathbf{d}$ and $\mathbf{d}$-sup $\mathbf{d}$ are written as ${}^{\circ}_{\circ}\mathbf{d}$ and $\sup\mathbf{d}$, which are the cases of primary interest. Indeed, ${}^{\bullet}_{\circ}\mathbf{d}$ and $\max\mathbf{d}$ coincide with $\overline{\mathbf{d}}$, as long as X is continuous w.r.t. $\mathbf{d}^{\bullet}_{\circ}$ and $\mathbf{d}$-max respectively.

First we consider $\mathcal{T}\mathbf{d}$.

Proposition 9.2. *For any $\mathbf{d} \in [0,\infty]^{X\times X}$, we have the following.*

1. *If $\leq^{\mathbf{d}}$ is reflexive then $\mathbf{d} \leq \mathcal{T}\mathbf{d}$.*
2. *If $\mathbf{d}$ is a distance then $\mathbf{d} \geq \underline{\mathcal{T}\mathbf{d}} \vee \overline{\mathcal{T}\mathbf{d}}$.*
3. *If $\mathbf{d}$ is a hemimetric or $\mathbf{d}_\circ \subseteq \mathcal{T}$ then $\mathcal{T}\mathbf{d}$ is a distance.*

Proof.

(1) Taking (z_λ) and z to be y in (9.1) yields $x\mathcal{T}\mathbf{d}y \geq x\mathbf{d}y$.

(2) By (△),

$$\begin{aligned} w\mathbf{d}z &\leq y\mathbf{d}z + w\mathbf{d}y \quad \text{so} \\ x\mathbf{d}z_\lambda - y\mathbf{d}z &\leq x\mathbf{d}z_\lambda - w\mathbf{d}z + w\mathbf{d}y \quad \text{and hence} \\ x\mathcal{T}\mathbf{d}y &\leq x\mathcal{T}\mathbf{d}w + w\mathbf{d}y. \end{aligned}$$

So $\mathcal{T}\mathbf{d} \leq \mathcal{T}\mathbf{d} \circ \mathbf{d}$, i.e. $\underline{\mathcal{T}\mathbf{d}} \leq \mathbf{d}$. Likewise, (△) yields

$$\begin{aligned} x\mathbf{d}z_\lambda &\leq x\mathbf{d}w + w\mathbf{d}z_\lambda \quad \text{so} \\ x\mathbf{d}z_\lambda - y\mathbf{d}z &\leq x\mathbf{d}w + w\mathbf{d}z_\lambda - y\mathbf{d}z \quad \text{and hence} \\ x\mathcal{T}\mathbf{d}y &\leq x\mathbf{d}w + w\mathcal{T}\mathbf{d}y. \end{aligned}$$

So $\mathcal{T}\mathbf{d} \leq \mathbf{d} \circ \mathcal{T}\mathbf{d}$, i.e. $\overline{\mathcal{T}\mathbf{d}} \leq \mathbf{d}$.

(3) If $\mathbf{d}$ is a hemimetric, this follows from (1), (2) and (2.2). If $\mathbf{d}_\circ \subseteq \mathcal{T}$ then $\mathbf{d}z \leq \mathbf{d}(z_\lambda)$ whenever $z_\lambda \xrightarrow{\mathcal{T}} z$ so

$$\begin{aligned} (x\mathbf{d}(z_\lambda) - y\mathbf{d}z)_+ &\leq (x\mathbf{d}(z_\lambda) - w\mathbf{d}z)_+ + (w\mathbf{d}z - y\mathbf{d}z)_+ \\ &\leq (x\mathbf{d}(z_\lambda) - w\mathbf{d}z)_+ + (w\mathbf{d}(z_\lambda) - y\mathbf{d}z)_+ \quad \text{so} \\ x\mathcal{T}\mathbf{d}y &\leq x\mathcal{T}\mathbf{d}w + w\mathcal{T}\mathbf{d}y. \end{aligned}$$

□

Order theory is consistently biased towards preorders over non-reflexive transitive relations, and domain theory is no exception. Indeed, an unbiased definition would say a domain is not a poset but rather a set together with two relations, $\leq$ and $\ll$, each definable from the other, satisfying certain completeness and continuity conditions, which can again be stated equivalently in terms of $\leq$ or $\ll$. This duality extends to quantitative domains, as the following result shows.

Recall our standing assumption that $\mathbf{d}$ and $\mathbf{e}$ are distances on X.

Theorem 9.3. *The following are equivalent.*

(1) X is $\mathbf{e}^\circ_\circ$-complete, $\mathbf{d}$-$\mathbf{e}^\circ_\circ$-continuous and $\mathbf{d} = {}^\circ_\circ\mathbf{e}$.
(2) X is $\mathbf{d}^\bullet_\circ$-complete, $\mathbf{d}^\bullet_\circ$-continuous and $\mathbf{e} = \underline{\mathbf{d}} \geq \overline{\mathbf{d}}$.

Proof.

(1)⇒(2) Assume (1). As X is $\mathbf{d}$-$\mathbf{e}^\circ_\circ$-continuous, $\mathbf{e}$ is must be a hemimetric, by (4.12). By Proposition 9.2, $\mathbf{d} = {}^\circ_\circ\mathbf{e}$ is a distance with $\underline{\mathbf{d}} \vee \overline{\mathbf{d}} \leq \mathbf{e} \leq \mathbf{d}$. As X is $\mathbf{d}$-$\mathbf{e}^\circ_\circ$-continuous, if $x \in X$ we have $\mathbf{d}$-Cauchy (x_λ) with $x = \mathbf{e}^\circ_\circ\text{-lim}\, x_\lambda$ so

$$x\mathbf{e}y = (x_\lambda)\mathbf{e}y \leq (x_\lambda)\mathbf{d}y = (x_\lambda)\underline{\mathbf{d}}y \leq (x_\lambda)\underline{\mathbf{d}}x + x\underline{\mathbf{d}}y = x\underline{\mathbf{d}}y,$$

by (3.4), i.e. $\mathbf{e} \leq \underline{\mathbf{d}}$ and hence $\mathbf{e} = \underline{\mathbf{d}}$. Next we claim that, for $\mathbf{d}$-Cauchy (x_λ), any $\mathbf{e}^\circ_\circ$-limit x is a $\mathbf{d}^\bullet_\circ$-limit. By (3.4), $(x_\lambda)\mathbf{d}x = (x_\lambda)\mathbf{e}x = 0$, so x is a $\mathbf{d}_\circ$-limit. Again by (3.4), and the definition of ${}^\circ_\circ\mathbf{e}$,

$$y\mathbf{d}(x_\lambda) = y\overline{\mathbf{d}}(x_\lambda) \leq y\mathbf{e}(x_\lambda) = (y\mathbf{e}(x_\lambda) - x\mathbf{e}x)_+ \leq y\mathbf{d}x,$$

i.e. $\mathbf{d}(x_\lambda) \leq \mathbf{d}x$ so x is also a $\mathbf{d}^\bullet$-limit. Thus the claim is proved and hence X is also $\mathbf{d}^\bullet_\circ$-continuous and $\mathbf{d}^\bullet_\circ$-complete.

(2)⇒(1) Assume (2). By (2.2), $\mathbf{e} = \underline{\mathbf{d}}$ is a distance, in fact a hemimetric. As X is $\mathbf{d}^\bullet_\circ$-continuous, for any $y \in X$, we have $\mathbf{d}$-Cauchy $y_\lambda \overset{\bullet}{\underset{\circ}{\to}} y$. By (4.9) $(y_\lambda)\mathbf{e} = y\mathbf{e}$. By (4.7) and (4.12), $y = \mathbf{e}^\circ_\circ\text{-lim}\, y_\lambda$ so X is $\mathbf{d}$-$\mathbf{e}^\circ_\circ$-continuous. By (3.4) and (4.8),

$$x\,{}^\circ_\circ\mathbf{e}y \geq (x\mathbf{e}(y_\lambda) - y\mathbf{e}y)_+ \geq x\overline{\mathbf{d}}(y_\lambda) = x\mathbf{d}(y_\lambda) = x\mathbf{d}y,$$

i.e. ${}^\circ_\circ\mathbf{e} \geq \mathbf{d}$. Now take $\mathbf{e}$-Cauchy (z_λ). By Theorem 8.3 (4), we have $\mathbf{d}$-Cauchy $(z'_\gamma) \subseteq X$ with $(z_\lambda)\mathbf{e} = (z'_\gamma)\mathbf{e}$ and $\mathbf{d}(z_\lambda) = \mathbf{d}(z'_\gamma)$. As X is $\mathbf{d}^\bullet_\circ$-complete, (z'_γ) has a $\mathbf{d}^\bullet_\circ$-limit z. By (4.7) and (4.12), z is also an $\mathbf{e}^\circ_\circ$-limit of (z'_γ). Thus $z\mathbf{e} = (z'_\gamma)\mathbf{e} = (z_\lambda)\mathbf{e}$, so z is also an $\mathbf{e}^\circ_\circ$-limit of (z_λ), i.e. X is $\mathbf{e}^\circ_\circ$-complete. On the other hand, if we are already given $z = \mathbf{e}^\circ_\circ\text{-lim}\, z_\lambda$ and hence $z = \mathbf{e}^\circ_\circ\text{-lim}\, z'_\gamma$ then $z'_\gamma \overset{\bullet}{\underset{\circ}{\to}} z$, by (4.10) and $\mathbf{d}^\bullet_\circ$-completeness again. Thus $\mathbf{e}(z_\lambda) \leq \mathbf{d}(z_\lambda) = \mathbf{d}(z'_\gamma) = \mathbf{d}z$ so, as $\mathbf{d} \leq \mathbf{d} \circ \mathbf{e}$,

$$(x\mathbf{e}(z_\lambda) - y\mathbf{e}z)_+ \leq (x\mathbf{d}z - y\mathbf{e}z)_+ \leq x\mathbf{d}y.$$

As (z_λ) was arbitrary, $\mathbf{e}^\circ_\circ \leq \mathbf{d}$ and hence $\mathbf{d} = \mathbf{e}^\circ_\circ$. □

We also have the following analogous results for the relational rather than topological notions, whose proofs are also very similar.

Proposition 9.4. *For any $\mathbf{d} \in [0,\infty]^{X\times X}$, we have the following.*

(1) If $\leq^{\mathbf{d}}$ is reflexive and $x\mathcal{R}\{x\}$, for all $x \in X$, then $\mathbf{d} \leq \mathcal{R}\mathbf{d}$.
(2) If $\mathbf{d}$ is a distance then $\mathbf{d} \geq \underline{\mathcal{R}\mathbf{d}} \vee \overline{\mathcal{R}\mathbf{d}}$.

(3) *If* $\mathbf{d}$ *is a hemimetric and* $x\mathcal{R}\{x\}$*, for all* $x \in X$*, or*

$$z\mathcal{R}Z \quad \Rightarrow \quad \mathbf{d}z \leq \mathbf{d}Z,$$

for all $z \in X$ *and* $Z \subseteq X$*, then* $\mathcal{R}\mathbf{d}$ *is a distance.*

Proof.

(1) Taking $Z = \{y\}$ and $z = y$ in (9.2) yields $x\mathcal{R}\mathbf{d}y \geq x\mathbf{d}y$.

(2) By ($\triangle$),

$$\begin{aligned} w\mathbf{d}z &\leq y\mathbf{d}z + w\mathbf{d}y \quad \text{so} \\ x\mathbf{d}Z - y\mathbf{d}z &\leq x\mathbf{d}Z - w\mathbf{d}z + w\mathbf{d}y \quad \text{and hence} \\ x\mathcal{R}\mathbf{d}y &\leq x\mathcal{R}\mathbf{d}w + w\mathbf{d}y. \end{aligned}$$

So $\mathcal{R}\mathbf{d} \leq \mathcal{R}\mathbf{d} \circ \mathbf{d}$, i.e. $\underline{\mathcal{R}\mathbf{d}} \leq \mathbf{d}$. Likewise, ($\triangle$) yields

$$\begin{aligned} x\mathbf{d}Z &\leq x\mathbf{d}w + w\mathbf{d}Z \quad \text{so} \\ x\mathbf{d}Z - y\mathbf{d}z &\leq x\mathbf{d}w + w\mathbf{d}Z - y\mathbf{d}z \quad \text{and hence} \\ x\mathcal{R}\mathbf{d}y &\leq x\mathbf{d}w + w\mathcal{R}\mathbf{d}y. \end{aligned}$$

So $\mathcal{R}\mathbf{d} \leq \mathbf{d} \circ \mathcal{R}\mathbf{d}$, i.e. $\overline{\mathcal{R}\mathbf{d}} \leq \mathbf{d}$.

(3) If $\mathbf{d}$ is a hemimetric and $x\mathcal{R}\{x\}$, this follows from (1), (2) and (2.2). If $z\mathcal{R}Z$ implies $\mathbf{d}z \leq \mathbf{d}Z$ then

$$\begin{aligned} (x\mathbf{d}Z - y\mathbf{d}z)_+ &\leq (x\mathbf{d}Z - w\mathbf{d}z)_+ + (w\mathbf{d}z - y\mathbf{d}z)_+ \\ &\leq (x\mathbf{d}Z - w\mathbf{d}z)_+ + (w\mathbf{d}Z - y\mathbf{d}z)_+ \quad \text{so} \\ x\mathcal{R}\mathbf{d}y &\leq x\mathcal{R}\mathbf{d}w + w\mathcal{R}\mathbf{d}y. \end{aligned}$$

□

Theorem 9.5. *The following are equivalent.*

(1) X *is* $\mathbf{e}$-sup-*complete,* $\mathbf{d}$-$\mathbf{e}$-sup-*continuous and* $\mathbf{d} = \sup \mathbf{e}$.

(2) X *is* $\mathbf{d}$-max-*complete,* $\mathbf{d}$-max-*continuous and* $\mathbf{e} = \underline{\mathbf{d}} \geq \overline{\mathbf{d}}$.

Proof.

(1)⇒(2) Assume (1). As X is $\mathbf{d}$-$\mathbf{e}$-sup-continuous, $\mathbf{e}$ is a hemimetric, by (6.3). By Proposition 9.4, $\mathbf{d} = \sup \mathbf{e}$ is a distance with $\underline{\mathbf{d}} \vee \overline{\mathbf{d}} \leq \mathbf{e} \leq \mathbf{d}$. As X is $\mathbf{d}$-$\mathbf{e}$-sup-continuous, if $x \in X$ we have $\mathbf{d}$-directed Y with $x = \mathbf{e}\text{-sup}\, Y$ so

$$x\mathbf{e}y = Y\mathbf{e}y \leq Y\mathbf{d}y = Y\underline{\mathbf{d}}y \leq Y\underline{\mathbf{d}}x + x\underline{\mathbf{d}}y = x\underline{\mathbf{d}}y,$$

by (5.2), i.e. $\mathbf{e} \leq \underline{\mathbf{d}}$ and hence $\mathbf{e} = \underline{\mathbf{d}}$. Next we claim that any $\mathbf{e}$-supremum x of $\mathbf{d}$-directed Y is a $\mathbf{d}$-maximum. By (5.2), $Y\mathbf{d}x = Y\mathbf{e}x = 0$, i.e. $Y \leq^{\mathbf{d}} x$. Again by (5.2), and the definition of $\sup \mathbf{e}$,

$$y\mathbf{d}Y = y\overline{\mathbf{d}}Y \leq y\mathbf{e}Y = (y\mathbf{e}Y - x\mathbf{e}x)_+ \leq y\mathbf{d}x,$$

i.e. $\mathbf{d}Y \leq \mathbf{d}x$ so x is also a $\mathbf{d}$-maximum. Thus the claim is proved and hence X is also $\mathbf{d}$-max-continuous and $\mathbf{d}$-max-complete.

(2)⇒(1) Assume (2). By (2.2), $\mathbf{e} = \underline{\mathbf{d}}$ is a distance, in fact a hemimetric. As X is $\mathbf{d}$-max-continuous, for any $y \in X$, we have $y = \mathbf{d}\text{-max}\, Y$, for some $\mathbf{d}$-directed Y. By (6.4), $y = \mathbf{e}\text{-sup}\, Y$ so X is $\mathbf{d}$-$\mathbf{e}$-sup-continuous. By (5.2),

$$x(\sup \mathbf{e})y \geq (x\mathbf{e}Y - y\mathbf{e}y)_+ \geq x\overline{\mathbf{d}}Y = x\mathbf{d}Y = x\mathbf{d}y,$$

i.e. $\sup \mathbf{e} \geq \mathbf{d}$. Now take $\mathbf{e}$-directed Z. By Theorem 8.4 (5), we have $\mathbf{d}$-directed $Z' \subseteq X$ with $Z\mathbf{e} = Z'\mathbf{e}$ and $\mathbf{d}Z = \mathbf{d}Z'$. As X is $\mathbf{d}$-max-complete, Z' has a $\mathbf{d}$-maximum z. By (6.4), z is also an $\mathbf{e}$-supremum of

Z'. Thus $z\mathbf{e} = Z'\mathbf{e} = Z\mathbf{e}$, so z is also an $\mathbf{e}$-supremum of Z, i.e. X is $\mathbf{e}$-sup-complete. On the other hand, if we are already given $z = \mathbf{e}\text{-sup}\, Z$ then $z = \mathbf{e}\text{-sup}\, Z'$ so $z = \mathbf{d}\text{-max}\, Z'$, by (6.6) and $\mathbf{d}$-max-completeness again. Thus $\mathbf{e}Z \le \mathbf{d}Z = \mathbf{d}Z' = \mathbf{d}z$ so, as $\mathbf{d} \le \mathbf{d} \circ \mathbf{e}$,

$$(x\mathbf{e}Z - y\mathbf{e}z)_+ \le (x\mathbf{d}z - y\mathbf{e}z)_+ \le x\mathbf{d}y.$$

As Z was arbitrary, $\sup \mathbf{e} \le \mathbf{d}$ and hence $\mathbf{d} = \sup \mathbf{e}$. □

We base our definition of domains on Theorem 9.3 (2) and Theorem 9.5 (2). This is dual to the usual focus on hemimetrics and preorders.

Definition 9.6. *For any topology $\mathcal{S}$ on X or relation $\mathcal{S} \subseteq X \times \mathcal{P}(X)$, define*

$$X \text{ is a } \mathbf{d}\text{-}\mathcal{S}\text{-predomain} \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \underline{\mathbf{d}} \ge \overline{\mathbf{d}} \text{ and } X \text{ is } \mathbf{d}\text{-}\mathcal{S}\text{-continuous}.$$

$$X \text{ is a } \mathbf{d}\text{-}\mathcal{S}\text{-domain} \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \underline{\mathbf{d}} \ge \overline{\mathbf{d}} \text{ and } X \text{ is } \mathbf{d}\text{-}\mathcal{S}\text{-continuous and } \mathbf{d}\text{-}\mathcal{S}\text{-complete}.$$

For a poset $(\mathbb{P}, \le)$, with way-below relation $\ll = {}^{\circ}_{\circ}{\le}_{\circ}^{\circ} = \sup \le$, Definition 9.6 generalizes the notion of 'domain' from (Gierz et al. 2003, Definition I-1.6). Specifically

$$\begin{aligned}(\mathbb{P}, \le) \text{ is a domain} \quad &\Leftrightarrow \quad \mathbb{P} \text{ is a } \ll^{\circ}_{\bullet}\text{-domain with } \le = \underline{\ll} \\ &\Leftrightarrow \quad \mathbb{P} \text{ is a } \ll\text{-max-domain with } \le = \underline{\ll}.\end{aligned}$$

Definition 9.6 also generalizes 'stratified predomain' from (Keimel 2016, §2.3), i.e.

$$\begin{aligned}(\mathbb{P}, \sqsubset) \text{ is a stratified predomain} \quad &\Leftrightarrow \quad \mathbb{P} \text{ is a } \sqsubset^{\circ}_{\bullet}\text{-predomain} \\ &\Leftrightarrow \quad \mathbb{P} \text{ is a } \sqsubset\text{-max-predomain}.\end{aligned}$$

(on its own 'predomain' in (Keimel 2016, §2.1) is synonymous with 'abstract basis' and hence with $\sqsubset^{\bullet}_{\circ}$-continuity or $\sqsubset$-max-continuity in our terminology). While domains usually refer to posets rather than prosets, we are not requiring $\le^{\underline{\mathbf{d}}}$ to be antisymmetric in Definition 9.6. Although we can always make $\le^{\underline{\mathbf{d}}}$ antisymmetric, if so desired, by identifying $\mathbf{d}$-equivalent points, as $\overline{\mathbf{d}} \le \underline{\mathbf{d}}$ implies that x and y are $\mathbf{d}$-equivalent iff $x\underline{\mathbf{d}}^{\vee}y = 0$.

As before, interpolation conditions connect $\mathbf{d}^{\bullet}_{\circ}$-domains and $\mathbf{d}$-max-domains.

Corollary 9.7.

$$\textit{If} \quad \underline{\mathbf{d}} \circ \le^{\mathbf{d}\mathcal{P}} \gtrsim \mathbf{d}\mathcal{P}, \quad \underline{\mathbf{d}}^{\vee} \circ \Phi^{\underline{\mathbf{d}}} \gtrsim \mathbf{d} \quad \textit{or} \quad \mathbf{d} \circ \le^{\mathbf{d}} \gtrsim \mathbf{d} \textit{ and } \le^{\mathcal{F}\mathbf{d}} \circ \underline{\mathbf{d}} \le \mathcal{F}\mathbf{d}$$

$$\textit{then} \quad X \textit{ is a } \mathbf{d}^{\bullet}_{\circ}\textit{-domain} \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad X \textit{ is an } \underline{\mathbf{d}}^{\vee}_{\circ}\textit{-complete } \mathbf{d}\text{-max-}\textit{domain}.$$

Proof. If X is a $\mathbf{d}^{\bullet}_{\circ}$-domain then X is $\underline{\mathbf{d}}^{\circ}_{\circ}$-complete, by Theorem 9.3. So any $\underline{\mathbf{d}}^{\vee}$-Cauchy (x_n) has a $\underline{\mathbf{d}}^{\circ}_{\circ}$-limit, which is a $\underline{\mathbf{d}}^{\vee}_{\circ}$-limit, by (4.11), i.e. X is $\underline{\mathbf{d}}^{\vee}_{\circ}$-complete. Now see the first three statements in Corollary 7.7 and Corollary 8.5. □

10. Hausdorff Distances

Definition 10.1. *For any $\mathbf{d} \in [0,\infty]^{X\times X}$, define $\mathbf{d}^{\mathcal{H}}$ and $\mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{H}}$ on $\mathcal{P}(X)$ by*

$$Y\mathbf{d}^{\mathcal{H}}Z = (Y\mathbf{d})Z = \inf_{z\in Z} \sup_{y\in Y} y\mathbf{d}z.$$

$$Y\mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{H}}Z = Y(\mathbf{d}Z) = \sup_{y\in Y} \inf_{z\in Z} y\mathbf{d}z.$$

The classical Hausdorff distance $\mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{H}}$ is well-known – see (Goubault-Larrecq 2013, Lemma 7.5.1) – but the 'reverse Hausdorff distance' $\mathbf{d}^{\mathcal{H}}$ does not appear to have been considered before. This could be due to the focus on hemimetrics over general distances, as $\leq^{\mathbf{d}^{\mathcal{H}}}$ often fails to be reflexive, e.g. when $\mathbf{d}$ is a metric and X has at least 2 points. However, it is $\mathbf{d}^{\mathcal{H}}$ that we need to complete predomains to domains.

First we note some basic functorial properties. In particular, it follows from (10.1), (10.2) and (10.3) that $\mathbf{d}^{\mathcal{H}}$ and $\mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{H}}$ are distances whenever $\mathbf{d}$ is a distance.

Proposition 10.2. *For any* $\mathbf{d}, \mathbf{e} \in [0,\infty]^{X\times X}$,

$$\mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{H}} \leq \mathbf{d}^{\mathcal{H}}. \tag{10.1}$$

$$(\mathbf{d}\circ\mathbf{e})_{\mathcal{H}} \leq \mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{H}}\circ\mathbf{e}_{\mathcal{H}} \precapprox (\mathbf{d}\circ\mathbf{e})_{\mathcal{H}}. \tag{10.2}$$

$$(\mathbf{d}\circ\mathbf{e})^{\mathcal{H}} \leq \mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{H}}\circ\mathbf{e}^{\mathcal{H}} \precapprox (\mathbf{d}\circ\mathbf{e})^{\mathcal{H}}. \tag{10.3}$$

$$\mathbf{d}^{\mathcal{H}}\circ\mathbf{e}^{\mathcal{H}} = \mathbf{d}^{\mathcal{H}}\circ\mathbf{e}_{\mathcal{H}}. \tag{10.4}$$

Proof.

(10.1) $Y\mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{H}}Z = Y(\mathbf{d}Z) = \sup_{y\in Y}\inf_{z\in Z} y\mathbf{d}z \leq \sup_{y\in Y}\inf_{z\in Z} Y\mathbf{d}z = (Y\mathbf{d})Z = Y\mathbf{d}^{\mathcal{H}}Z.$

(10.2) First note that

$$\begin{aligned}
Y(\mathbf{d}\circ\mathbf{e})_{\mathcal{H}}Z &= Y((\mathbf{d}\circ\mathbf{e})Z)\\
&= \sup_{y\in Y}\inf_{w\in W}\inf_{z\in Z} y(\mathbf{d}\circ\mathbf{e})z\\
&\leq \sup_{y\in Y}\inf_{w\in W}\inf_{z\in Z}(y\mathbf{d}w + w\mathbf{e}z)\\
&= \sup_{y\in Y}\inf_{w\in W}(y\mathbf{d}w + w\mathbf{e}Z)\\
&\leq \sup_{y\in Y}(y\mathbf{d}W + W(\mathbf{e}Z))\\
&= Y(\mathbf{d}W) + W(\mathbf{e}Z)\\
&= Y\mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{H}}W + W\mathbf{e}_{\mathcal{H}}Z,
\end{aligned}$$

i.e. $(\mathbf{d}\circ\mathbf{e})_{\mathcal{H}} \leq \mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{H}}\circ\mathbf{e}_{\mathcal{H}}$. On the other hand, for any $r > Y((\mathbf{d}\circ\mathbf{e})Z)$ and $y \in Y$, we have $w_y \in X$ and $z \in Z$ with $y\mathbf{d}w_y + w_y\mathbf{e}z < r$. For $W = \{w_y : y \in Y\}$ we then have $Y(\mathbf{d}W) + W(\mathbf{d}Z) \leq 2r$ and hence

$$\mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{H}}\circ\mathbf{e}_{\mathcal{H}} \leq 2(\mathbf{d}\circ\mathbf{e})_{\mathcal{H}}.$$

(10.3) First note that

$$\begin{aligned}
&Y(\mathbf{d}\circ\mathbf{e})^{\mathcal{H}}Z\\
&= (Y(\mathbf{d}\circ\mathbf{e}))Z\\
&= \inf_{z\in Z}\sup_{y\in Y}\inf_{w\in W}(y\mathbf{d}w + w\mathbf{e}z)\\
&\leq \inf_{z\in Z}\sup_{y\in Y}(y\mathbf{d}W + W\mathbf{e}z)\\
&= Y(\mathbf{d}W) + (W\mathbf{e})Z\\
&= Y\mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{H}}W + W\mathbf{e}^{\mathcal{H}}Z,
\end{aligned}$$

i.e. $(\mathbf{d}\circ\mathbf{e})^{\mathcal{H}} \leq \mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{H}}\circ\mathbf{e}^{\mathcal{H}}$. On the other hand, for any $r > (Y(\mathbf{d}\circ\mathbf{e})Z$, we have $z \in Z$ such that, for all $y \in Y$, there is some $w_y \in X$ with $y\mathbf{d}w_y + w_y\mathbf{e}z < r$.

For $W = \{w_y : y \in Y\}$ we then have $Y(\mathbf{d}W) + (W\mathbf{d})Z \leq 2r$ and hence

$$\mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{H}} \circ \mathbf{e}^{\mathcal{H}} \leq 2(\mathbf{d} \circ \mathbf{e})^{\mathcal{H}}.$$

(10.4) By (10.1), we have $\mathbf{d}^{\mathcal{H}} \circ \mathbf{e}_{\mathcal{H}} \leq \mathbf{d}^{\mathcal{H}} \circ \mathbf{e}^{\mathcal{H}}$. Conversely,

$$\begin{aligned} Y(\mathbf{d}^{\mathcal{H}} \circ \mathbf{e}^{\mathcal{H}})Z &\leq \inf_{w \in W}(Y\mathbf{d}^{\mathcal{H}}\{w\} + \{w\}\mathbf{e}^{\mathcal{H}}Z) \\ &= \inf_{w \in W}(Y\mathbf{d}w + w\mathbf{e}Z) \\ &\leq (Y\mathbf{d})W + W(\mathbf{e}Z) \\ &= Y\mathbf{d}^{\mathcal{H}}W + W\mathbf{e}_{\mathcal{H}}Z. \end{aligned}$$

□

Proposition 10.3. *$\mathcal{P}(X)$ is $\mathbf{d}^{\mathcal{H}}$-max-complete and $\mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{H}}$-sup-complete.*

Proof. Note $\mathbf{d}^{\mathcal{H}}\mathcal{Y} = \mathbf{d}^{\mathcal{H}}(\bigcup \mathcal{Y})$, as

$$Z\mathbf{d}^{\mathcal{H}}\mathcal{Y} = \inf_{Y \in \mathcal{Y}} Z\mathbf{d}^{\mathcal{H}}Y = \inf_{Y \in \mathcal{Y}}(Z\mathbf{d})Y = (Z\mathbf{d})\bigcup Y = Z\mathbf{d}^{\mathcal{H}}(\bigcup Y).$$

So if $\mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(X)$ is $\mathbf{d}^{\mathcal{H}}$-directed or just $\mathbf{d}^{\mathcal{H}}$-final then $\bigcup \mathcal{Y} = \mathbf{d}^{\mathcal{H}}\text{-max}\,\mathcal{Y}$, by (6.5), i.e. $\mathcal{P}(X)$ is $\mathbf{d}^{\mathcal{H}}$-max-complete. Likewise $\mathcal{Y}\mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{H}} = (\bigcup \mathcal{Y})\mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{H}}$, as

$$\mathcal{Y}\mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{H}}Z = \sup_{Y \in \mathcal{Y}} Y\mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{H}}Z = \sup_{Y \in \mathcal{Y}} Y(\mathbf{d}Z) = \bigcup Y(\mathbf{d}Z) = (\bigcup \mathcal{Y})\mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{H}}Z.$$

If $\mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(X)$ is $\mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{H}}$-directed or just $\mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{H}}$-final then, for all $Z \in \mathcal{Y}$,

$$Z\mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{H}}\bigcup \mathcal{Y} = Z(\mathbf{d}\bigcup \mathcal{Y}) \leq \inf_{Y \in \mathcal{Y}} Z(\mathbf{d}Y) = \inf_{Y \in \mathcal{Y}} Z\mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{H}}Y = Z\mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{H}}\mathcal{Y} = 0,$$

i.e. $Z \leq^{\mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{H}}} \bigcup \mathcal{Y}$ and hence $\bigcup \mathcal{Y} = \mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{H}}\text{-sup}\,\mathcal{Y}$, i.e. $\mathcal{P}(X)$ is $\mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{H}}$-sup-complete. □

Note that $\leq^{\mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{H}}}$ is reflexive precisely on the $\mathbf{d}$-final subsets of X. In fact, we are primarily interested in the $\mathbf{d}$-directed subsets

$$\mathcal{P}^{\mathbf{d}}(X) = \{Y \subseteq X : Y \text{ is } \mathbf{d}\text{-directed}\}.$$

In contrast to $\leq^{\mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{H}}}$, there is no guarantee that $\leq^{\mathbf{d}^{\mathcal{H}}}$ is reflexive on $\mathcal{P}^{\mathbf{d}}(X)$, even when $\mathbf{d}$ is a hemimetric. But there is one special situation in which this occurs.

Proposition 10.4. *The following are equivalent.*

(1) Every $\mathbf{d}$-pre-Cauchy net in X is $\mathbf{d}^{\text{op}}$-Cauchy.
(2) Every $\mathbf{d}$-Cauchy sequence in X has a $\mathbf{d}^{\text{op}}$-pre-Cauchy subnet.

In this case $\mathbf{d}^{\mathcal{H}}$ is a hemimetric on $\mathcal{P}^{\mathbf{d}}(X)$.

Proof.

(1)⇒(2) Immediate.

(2)⇒(1) Assume $(x_\lambda) \subseteq X$ is $\mathbf{d}$-pre-Cauchy but not $\mathbf{d}^{\text{op}}$-Cauchy. So (x_λ) is not even $\mathbf{d}^{\text{op}}$-pre-Cauchy, otherwise (x_λ) would be $\mathbf{d}^{\vee}$-pre-Cauchy and hence $\mathbf{d}^{\vee}$-Cauchy, by Proposition 3.2. Thus we have

$$\lim_\gamma x_\gamma \mathbf{d}(x_\lambda) = 0.$$

$$\epsilon = \limsup_\gamma (x_\lambda)\mathbf{d}x_\gamma > 0.$$

Thus we can take λ_1 with

$$\lim_\gamma x_{\lambda_1}\mathbf{d}x_\gamma < \epsilon/4.$$
$$\lim_\gamma x_\gamma\mathbf{d}x_{\lambda_1} > \epsilon/2.$$

Then we can take λ_2 with $x_{\lambda_1}\mathbf{d}x_{\lambda_2} < \epsilon/4$, $x_{\lambda_2}\mathbf{d}x_{\lambda_1} > \epsilon/2$ and

$$\lim_\gamma x_{\lambda_2}\mathbf{d}x_\gamma < \epsilon/16.$$
$$\lim_\gamma x_\gamma\mathbf{d}x_{\lambda_1} > \epsilon/2.$$

Continuing in this way we obtain a sequence $x_n = x_{\lambda_n}$ such that

$$x_{n-1}\mathbf{d}x_n < \epsilon/4^{n+1}$$
$$x_n\mathbf{d}x_{n-1} > \epsilon/2.$$

Thus (x_n) is $\mathbf{d}$-Cauchy and, for any $m < n$, $x_m\mathbf{d}x_n < \epsilon/3$ and hence

$$x_{n+1}\mathbf{d}x_m \geq x_{n+1}\mathbf{d}x_n - x_m\mathbf{d}x_n > \epsilon/6,$$

so (x_n) has no $\mathbf{d}^{\mathrm{op}}$-pre-Cauchy subnet.

For any $Y \in \mathcal{P}^{\mathbf{d}}(X)$, we have $\mathbf{d}$-pre-Cauchy $(x_\lambda) \subseteq Y \leq^{\mathbf{d}} (x_\lambda)$, by Proposition 5.3. If (1) holds then (x_λ) is $\mathbf{d}^{\mathrm{op}}$-(pre-)Cauchy so, for any $\epsilon > 0$, we have γ such that $(x_\lambda)\mathbf{d}x_\gamma < \epsilon$. Thus, for all $y \in Y$, $y\mathbf{d}x_\gamma \leq y\mathbf{d}(x_\lambda) + (x_\lambda)\mathbf{d}x_\gamma < \epsilon$ and hence $Y\mathbf{d}^{\mathcal{H}}Y \leq Y\mathbf{d}x_\gamma < \epsilon$, i.e. $Y\mathbf{d}^{\mathcal{H}}Y = 0$. □

Now we generalize the construction of a domain from an abstract basis.

Theorem 10.5. *If X is* $\mathbf{d}$-max-*continuous then*

$$\underline{\mathbf{d}^{\mathcal{H}}|_{\mathcal{P}^{\mathbf{d}}(X)}} \;=\; \mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{H}}|_{\mathcal{P}^{\mathbf{d}}(X)}. \tag{10.5}$$

*Moreover, $\mathcal{P}^{\mathbf{d}}(X)$ is a $\mathbf{d}^{\mathcal{H}}$-*max-*domain with $\mathbf{d}^{\mathcal{H}}$-*max-*basis $\{(\leq^{\mathbf{d}} x) : x \in X\}$ and*

$$(\leq^{\mathbf{d}} x)\mathbf{d}^{\mathcal{H}}(\leq^{\mathbf{d}} y) \;\leq\; x\mathbf{d}y. \tag{10.6}$$

Proof.

(10.5) As $\mathbf{d} \leq \mathbf{d} \circ \underline{\mathbf{d}}$, (10.3) yields $\mathbf{d}^{\mathcal{H}} \leq \mathbf{d}^{\mathcal{H}} \circ \underline{\mathbf{d}}_{\mathcal{H}}$ and hence $\underline{\mathbf{d}^{\mathcal{H}}} \leq \underline{\mathbf{d}}_{\mathcal{H}} \leq \mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{H}}$. Conversely, as X is $\mathbf{d}$-max-continuous, (5.2) and (6.4) yield

$$\begin{aligned} Y\mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{H}}Z = Y(\mathbf{d}Z) &= \sup_{y\in Y}\inf_{z\in Z} y\mathbf{d}z \\ &= \sup_{y\in Y}\inf_{z\in Z}(\leq^{\mathbf{d}} y)\mathbf{d}z \\ &= \sup_{y\in Y}((\leq^{\mathbf{d}} y)\mathbf{d})Z \\ &= \sup_{y\in Y}((\leq^{\mathbf{d}} y)\mathbf{d}^{\mathcal{H}}Z - (\leq^{\mathbf{d}} y)\mathbf{d}^{\mathcal{H}}Y). \end{aligned}$$

As $(\leq^{\mathbf{d}} y) \in \mathcal{P}^{\mathbf{d}}(X)$, this shows that

$$\mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{H}}|_{\mathcal{P}^{\mathbf{d}}(X)} \leq \underline{\mathbf{d}^{\mathcal{H}}|_{\mathcal{P}^{\mathbf{d}}(X)}} \leq \underline{\mathbf{d}^{\mathcal{H}}}|_{\mathcal{P}^{\mathbf{d}}(X)} \leq \mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{H}}|_{\mathcal{P}^{\mathbf{d}}(X)}.$$

As X is $\mathbf{d}$-max-continuous, $(\leq^{\mathbf{d}} x)$ is $\mathbf{d}$-directed with $\mathbf{d}$-maximum x, for all $x \in X$. Thus if $Y \in \mathcal{P}^{\mathbf{d}}(X)$ then $\mathcal{Y} = \{(\leq^{\mathbf{d}} y) : y \in Y\}$ is $\mathbf{d}^{\mathcal{H}}$-directed. Indeed if $G \in \mathcal{F}(Y)$ let $\mathcal{G} = \{(\leq^{\mathbf{d}} y) : y \in G\}$ so

$$\begin{aligned}(\mathcal{G}\mathbf{d}^{\mathcal{H}})\mathcal{Y} &= \inf_{y\in Y} \sup_{z\in G} (\leq^{\mathbf{d}} z)\mathbf{d}^{\mathcal{H}}(\leq^{\mathbf{d}} y) = \inf_{y\in Y} \sup_{z\in G} ((\leq^{\mathbf{d}} z)\mathbf{d})(\leq^{\mathbf{d}} y)\\ &\leq \inf_{y\in Y} \sup_{z\in G} z\mathbf{d}(\leq^{\mathbf{d}} y) = \inf_{y\in Y} \sup_{z\in G} z\mathbf{d}y = (G\mathbf{d})Y = 0,\end{aligned}$$

as Y is $\mathbf{d}$-directed. For all $y \in Y$, $(\leq^{\mathbf{d}} y)\mathbf{d}^{\mathcal{H}}Y = ((\leq^{\mathbf{d}} y)\mathbf{d})Y \leq (\leq^{\mathbf{d}} y)\mathbf{d}y = 0$, i.e. $(\leq^{\mathbf{d}} y) \leq^{\mathbf{d}^{\mathcal{H}}} Y$. Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned}Z\mathbf{d}^{\mathcal{H}}\mathcal{Y} &= \inf_{y\in Y} Z\mathbf{d}^{\mathcal{H}}(\leq^{\mathbf{d}} y) = \inf_{y\in Y}(Z\mathbf{d})(\leq^{\mathbf{d}} y) = \inf_{w\in Y} \inf_{y\in Y, x\leq^{\mathbf{d}} y} \sup_{z\in Z} z\mathbf{d}x\\ &\leq \inf_{w\in Y} \inf_{y\in Y, x\leq^{\mathbf{d}} y} \sup_{z\in Z}(z\mathbf{d}w + w\mathbf{d}x) = \inf_{w\in Y} \inf_{y\in Y}(Z\mathbf{d}w + w\mathbf{d}(\leq^{\mathbf{d}} y))\\ &= \inf_{w\in Y} \inf_{y\in Y}(Z\mathbf{d}w + w\mathbf{d}y) = \inf_{w\in Y}(Z\mathbf{d}w + w\mathbf{d}Y)\\ &\leq (Z\mathbf{d})Y + Y(\mathbf{d}Y) = (Z\mathbf{d})Y\\ &= Z\mathbf{d}^{\mathcal{H}}Y,\end{aligned}$$

i.e. $\mathbf{d}^{\mathcal{H}}\mathcal{Y} \leq \mathbf{d}^{\mathcal{H}}Y$ so $Y = \mathbf{d}^{\mathcal{H}}\text{-max}\,\mathcal{Y}$. Thus $\mathcal{P}^{\mathbf{d}}(X)$ is $\mathbf{d}^{\mathcal{H}}$-max-continuous with $\mathbf{d}^{\mathcal{H}}$-max-basis $\{(\leq^{\mathbf{d}} x) : x \in X\}$.

If $\mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathcal{P}^{\mathbf{d}}(X)$ is $\mathbf{d}^{\mathcal{H}}$-directed (or just $\mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{H}}$-directed) then $\bigcup \mathcal{Y} \in \mathcal{P}^{\mathbf{d}}(X)$, so $\mathcal{P}^{\mathbf{d}}(X)$ is $\mathbf{d}^{\mathcal{H}}$-max-complete, as in Proposition 10.3. By (10.3), $\mathbf{d}^{\mathcal{H}} \leq \mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{H}} \circ \mathbf{d}^{\mathcal{H}}$ so $\overline{\mathbf{d}^{\mathcal{H}}} \leq \mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{H}}$ and hence, by (10.5),

$$\overline{\mathbf{d}^{\mathcal{H}}|_{\mathcal{P}^{\mathbf{d}}(X)}} \leq \overline{\mathbf{d}^{\mathcal{H}}}|_{\mathcal{P}^{\mathbf{d}}(X)} \leq \mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{H}}|_{\mathcal{P}^{\mathbf{d}}(X)} = \underline{\mathbf{d}^{\mathcal{H}}|_{\mathcal{P}^{\mathbf{d}}(X)}}.$$

Thus $\mathcal{P}^{\mathbf{d}}(X)$ is a $\mathbf{d}^{\mathcal{H}}$-max-domain.

(10.6) Note (5.2) and (6.4) yields

$$\begin{aligned}(\leq^{\mathbf{d}} x)\mathbf{d}^{\mathcal{H}}(\leq^{\mathbf{d}} y) &= ((\leq^{\mathbf{d}} x)\mathbf{d})(\leq^{\mathbf{d}} y)\\ &= ((\leq^{\mathbf{d}} x)\underline{\mathbf{d}})(\leq^{\mathbf{d}} y)\\ &= x\underline{\mathbf{d}}(\leq^{\mathbf{d}} y)\\ &\leq x\mathbf{d}(\leq^{\mathbf{d}} y)\\ &= x\mathbf{d}y.\end{aligned}$$

□

Corollary 10.6. *The following are equivalent.*

(1) X is a $\mathbf{d}$-max-predomain.

(2) X is a $\mathbf{d}'$-max-basis of a $\mathbf{d}'$-max-domain $X' \supseteq X$ with $\mathbf{d}'|_X = \mathbf{d}$.

Proof.

(1)⇒(2) Assume (1) and let X' be the (disjoint) union of X and $\mathcal{P}^{\mathbf{d}}(X)$. Extend $\mathbf{d}^{\mathcal{H}}$ to $\mathbf{d}'$ on X' by making each $x \in X$ $\mathbf{d}'$-equivalent to $(\leq^{\mathbf{d}} x)$. By Theorem 10.5, the only thing left to show is that the inequality in (10.6) is an equality. For this, simply note that $\overline{\mathbf{d}} \leq \underline{\mathbf{d}}$ implies

$$(\leq^{\mathbf{d}} x)\mathbf{d}^{\mathcal{H}}(\leq^{\mathbf{d}} y) = x\underline{\mathbf{d}}(\leq^{\mathbf{d}} y) \geq x\overline{\mathbf{d}}(\leq^{\mathbf{d}} y) = x\mathbf{d}(\leq^{\mathbf{d}} y) = x\mathbf{d}y. \tag{10.7}$$

(2)⇒(1) If $X \subseteq X'$ is a $\mathbf{d}'$-max-basis and $\mathbf{d} = \mathbf{d}'|_X$ then X is certainly $\mathbf{d}$-max-continuous. If X' is also a $\mathbf{d}'$-max-(pre)domain then $\overline{\mathbf{d}} = \overline{\mathbf{d}'}|_X \leq \underline{\mathbf{d}'}|_X = \underline{\mathbf{d}}$, by Proposition 8.8, i.e. X is a $\mathbf{d}$-max-predomain. □

In other words, (1)⇒(2) above is saying every $\mathbf{d}$-predomain X has a completion X'. If we want to identify $\mathbf{d}'$-equivalent points in X' we can restrict $\mathbf{d}^{\mathcal{H}}$ further to

$$\mathcal{I}^{\mathbf{d}}(X) = \{I \subseteq X : I \text{ is a } \mathbf{d}\text{-ideal}\}.$$

Theorem 10.7. *If B is a* $\mathbf{d}$-max-*basis of* $\mathbf{d}$-max-*predomain X,*

$$x \mapsto (\leq^{\mathbf{d}} x) \cap B \tag{10.8}$$

is an isometry to $\mathbf{d}^{\mathcal{H}}$-max-domain $\mathcal{I}^{\mathbf{d}}(B)$, which is onto iff X is a $\mathbf{d}$-max-*domain.*

Proof. As B is a $\mathbf{d}$-max-basis, $(\leq^{\mathbf{d}} x)\cap B \in \mathcal{I}^{\mathbf{d}}(B)$, for all $x \in X$. Every $Y \in \mathcal{P}^{\mathbf{d}}(B)$ is $\mathbf{d}^{\mathcal{H}}$-equivalent to $\overline{Y}^{\bullet} \in \mathcal{I}^{\mathbf{d}}(B)$ so $\mathcal{I}^{\mathbf{d}}(B)$ is also a $\mathbf{d}^{\mathcal{H}}$-max-domain and

$$((\leq^{\mathbf{d}} x) \cap B)\mathbf{d}^{\mathcal{H}}((\leq^{\mathbf{d}} y) \cap B) \;=\; x\mathbf{d}y,$$

i.e. (10.8) is an isometry. Also, as B is a $\mathbf{d}$-max-basis, for $Y \in \mathcal{P}^{\mathbf{d}}(X)$,

$$x = \mathbf{d}\text{-max}\, Y \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \mathbf{d}x = \mathbf{d}Y = \mathbf{d}\overline{Y}^{\bullet} \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad (\leq^{\mathbf{d}} x) \cap B = \overline{Y}^{\bullet} \cap B,$$

so (10.8) is onto iff X is $\mathbf{d}$-max-complete and hence a $\mathbf{d}$-max-domain. □

In other words $\mathcal{I}^{\mathbf{d}}(B)$ is universal among $\mathbf{d}$-max-predomain extensions of B, and unique among $\mathbf{d}$-max-domain extensions, up to isometry (and $\mathbf{d}$-equivalence).

At this point we could develop a parallel theory of Hausdorff distances on nets $\mathsf{N}(X)$ on X, specifically we could define

$$(y_\lambda)\mathbf{d}^{\mathsf{H}}(z_\gamma) = ((y_\lambda)\mathbf{d})(z_\gamma) = \liminf_\gamma \limsup_\lambda y_\lambda \mathbf{d} z_\gamma.$$
$$(y_\lambda)\mathbf{d}_{\mathsf{H}}(z_\gamma) = (y_\lambda)(\mathbf{d}(z_\gamma)) = \limsup_\lambda \liminf_\gamma y_\lambda \mathbf{d} z_\gamma.$$

The analog of Proposition 10.2 would be no problem, but completeness and continuity would involve nets of nets, which are technically challenging to work with. Instead, to get topological analogs of the above results, we turn to formal balls.

11. Formal Balls

The following is based on (Goubault-Larrecq 2013, Definition 7.3.1), although the formal ball construction goes back to (Weihrauch and Schreiber 1981).

Definition 11.1. *For any $\mathbf{d} \in [0,\infty]^{X\times X}$, define $\mathbf{d}_+$ on $X_+ = X \times [0,\infty)$ by*

$$(x,r)\mathbf{d}_+(y,s) = (x\mathbf{d}y - r + s)_+.$$

This does not quite extend to a functor on **GRel**, as $_+$ does not preserve identity morphisms. Indeed, recall that we identify $=$ with its characteristic function, so

$$(x,r) =_+ (y,s) \;=\; \begin{cases} (s-r)_+ & \text{if } x = y \\ \infty & \text{if } x \neq y, \end{cases}$$

which is not (the characteristic function of) $=$ on X_+. However, $_+$ does preserve composition. In particular, this means $\mathbf{d}_+$ is a distance whenever $\mathbf{d}$ is.

Proposition 11.2. *For any $\mathbf{d}, \mathbf{e} \in [0,\infty]^{X\times X}$, we have $(\mathbf{d}\circ\mathbf{e})_+ = \mathbf{d}_+ \circ \mathbf{e}_+$,*

$$\underline{\mathbf{d}_+} = \underline{\mathbf{d}}_+ \qquad \text{and} \qquad \overline{\mathbf{d}_+} = \overline{\mathbf{d}}_+.$$

Proof. For $(\mathbf{d}\circ\mathbf{e})_+ = \mathbf{d}_+\circ\mathbf{e}_+$, note

$$\begin{aligned}(x,r)(\mathbf{d}_+\circ\mathbf{e}_+)(y,s) &= \inf_{z\in X,t\in\mathbb{R}_+}(x,r)\mathbf{d}_+(z,t)+(z,t)\mathbf{e}_+(y,s).\\ &= \inf_{z\in X,t\in\mathbb{R}_+}(x\mathbf{d}z-r+t)_+ + (z\mathbf{e}y-t+s)_+.\\ &= \inf_{z\in X,z\mathbf{e}y<\infty,t=z\mathbf{e}y+s}(x\mathbf{d}z-r+t)_+ + (z\mathbf{e}y-t+s)_+.\\ &= \inf_{z\in X}(x\mathbf{d}z+z\mathbf{e}y-r+s)_+.\\ &= (x(\mathbf{d}\circ\mathbf{e})y-r+s)_+\\ &= (x,r)(\mathbf{d}\circ\mathbf{e})_+(y,s).\end{aligned}$$

As $\mathbf{d}\le\mathbf{d}\circ\underline{\mathbf{d}}$, we have $\mathbf{d}_+\le\mathbf{d}_+\circ\underline{\mathbf{d}}_+$ so $\underline{\mathbf{d}_+}\le\underline{\mathbf{d}}_+$. Conversely,

$$\begin{aligned}(x,r)\underline{\mathbf{d}_+}(y,s) &= \sup_{z\in X,t\in\mathbb{R}_+}((z,t)\mathbf{d}_+(y,s)-(z,t)\mathbf{d}_+(x,r))_+\\ &= \sup_{z\in X,t\in\mathbb{R}_+}((z\mathbf{d}y-t+s)_+-(z\mathbf{d}x-t+r)_+)_+\\ &\ge \sup_{z\in X,t=0}((z\mathbf{d}y-t+s)_+-(z\mathbf{d}x-t+r)_+)_+\\ &= \sup_{z\in X}(z\mathbf{d}y-z\mathbf{d}x-r+s)_+\\ &= (x\underline{\mathbf{d}}y-r+s)_+\\ &= (x,r)\underline{\mathbf{d}}_+(y,s).\end{aligned}$$

Likewise, $\mathbf{d}\le\overline{\mathbf{d}}\circ\mathbf{d}$ so $\mathbf{d}_+\le\overline{\mathbf{d}}_+\circ\mathbf{d}_+$ and hence $\overline{\mathbf{d}_+}\le\overline{\mathbf{d}}_+$, while

$$\begin{aligned}(x,r)\overline{\mathbf{d}_+}(y,s) &= \sup_{z\in X,t\in\mathbb{R}_+}((x,r)\mathbf{d}_+(z,t)-(y,s)\mathbf{d}_+(z,t))_+\\ &= \sup_{z\in X,t\in\mathbb{R}_+}((x\mathbf{d}z-r+t)_+-(y\mathbf{d}z-s+t)_+)_+\\ &\ge \sup_{z\in X,t>r\vee s}((x\mathbf{d}z-r+t)_+-(y\mathbf{d}z-s+t)_+)_+\\ &= \sup_{z\in X}(x\mathbf{d}z-y\mathbf{d}z-r+s)_+\\ &= (x\overline{\mathbf{d}}y-r+s)_+\\ &= (x,r)\overline{\mathbf{d}}_+(y,s).\end{aligned}$$

□

Formal balls were originally introduced just as order structures $(X_+,\le^{\mathbf{d}_+})$ with the primary purpose of reducing metric theory to order theory. Indeed, we can always recover $\mathbf{d}$ from the order structure so this reduction is always possible, at least in principle.

Proposition 11.3. *For any* $\mathbf{d}\in[0,\infty]^{X\times X}$, $x\mathbf{d}y = \min_{(x,r)\le^{\mathbf{d}_+}(y,0)} r = \inf_{(x,r)<^{\mathbf{d}_+}(y,0)} r$.

Proof. This follows directly from

$$(x,r)\le^{\mathbf{d}_+}(y,s) \quad\Leftrightarrow\quad x\mathbf{d}y\le r-s. \tag{11.1}$$

$$(x,r)<^{\mathbf{d}_+}(y,s) \quad\Leftrightarrow\quad x\mathbf{d}y< r-s. \tag{11.2}$$

Indeed, (11.1) is immediate from the definitions. For (11.2), say $\epsilon = r-s-x\mathbf{d}y>0$ and $(y,s)<^{\frac{\mathbf{d}_+}{\epsilon}}(z,t)$, i.e. $(y,s)\underline{\mathbf{d}}_+(z,t)<\epsilon$. Then $y\underline{\mathbf{d}}z-s+t<\epsilon = r-s-x\mathbf{d}y$ so $x\mathbf{d}z\le x\mathbf{d}y+y\underline{\mathbf{d}}z<r-t$ and hence $(x,r)\le^{\mathbf{d}_+}(z,t)$. Thus $(x,r)<^{\mathbf{d}_+}(y,s)$.

Conversely, if $\epsilon > 0$ and $(x,r) \leq^{\mathbf{d}_+} (z,t)$, for all (z,t) with $(y,s)\underline{\mathbf{d}}_+(z,t) < \epsilon$ then, in particular, $(x,r) \leq^{\mathbf{d}_+} (y, s+\frac{1}{2}\epsilon)$ so $x\mathbf{d}y \leq r - s - \frac{1}{2}\epsilon < r - s$. □

Recall our standing assumption (for (11.5)) that $\mathbf{d}$ is a distance on X.

Proposition 11.4. $<^{(\mathbf{d}\circ\mathbf{e})_+} = <^{\mathbf{d}_+} \circ <^{\mathbf{e}_+} = <^{\mathbf{d}_+} \circ \leq^{\mathbf{e}_+} = \leq^{\mathbf{d}_+} \circ <^{\mathbf{e}_+}$ *and*

$$\overline{\mathbf{d}} \leq \mathbf{e} \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \overline{<^{\mathbf{d}_+}} \supseteq \leq^{\mathbf{e}_+}. \tag{11.3}$$

$$\mathbf{0} \circ \mathbf{d} = \mathbf{0} \quad \Rightarrow \quad \underline{<^{\mathbf{d}_+}} = \leq^{\underline{\mathbf{d}}_+}. \tag{11.4}$$

Conversely, if X_+ is a $<^{\mathbf{d}_+}$-domain then

$$\mathbf{0} \circ \mathbf{d} = \mathbf{0} \quad \Leftarrow \quad \underline{<^{\mathbf{d}_+}} = \leq^{\mathbf{e}_+}. \tag{11.5}$$

Proof. If $(x,r) <^{\mathbf{d}_+} (z,t) \leq^{\mathbf{e}_+} (y,s)$ then $x\mathbf{d}z < r - t$ and $y\mathbf{e}z < t - s$ and hence $x(\mathbf{d}\circ\mathbf{e})y \leq x\mathbf{d}z + z\mathbf{e}y < r - s$, i.e. $(x,r) <^{(\mathbf{d}\circ\mathbf{e})_+} (y,s)$. Likewise, $(x,r) \leq^{\mathbf{d}_+} (z,t) <^{\mathbf{e}_+} (y,s)$ implies $(x,r) <^{(\mathbf{d}\circ\mathbf{e})_+} (y,s)$ so

$$<^{\mathbf{d}_+} \circ <^{\mathbf{e}_+} \quad \subseteq \quad <^{\mathbf{d}_+} \circ \leq^{\mathbf{e}_+}, \ \leq^{\mathbf{d}_+} \circ <^{\mathbf{e}_+} \quad \subseteq \quad <^{(\mathbf{d}\circ\mathbf{e})_+}.$$

On the other hand, if $(x,r) <^{(\mathbf{d}\circ\mathbf{e})_+} (y,s)$, i.e. $x(\mathbf{d}\circ\mathbf{e})y < r - s$ then we have $z \in X$ and $\epsilon > 0$ with $x\mathbf{d}z + z\mathbf{e}y < r - s - \epsilon$ so $(x,r) <^{\mathbf{d}_+} (z, s + z\mathbf{e}y + \epsilon) <^{\mathbf{e}_+} (y,s)$.

(11.3) By Proposition 11.3,

$$\leq^{\mathbf{e}_+} \subseteq \overline{<^{\mathbf{d}_+}} \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad <^{(\mathbf{e}\circ\mathbf{d})_+} = \leq^{\mathbf{e}_+} \circ <^{\mathbf{d}_+} \subseteq <^{\mathbf{d}_+} \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \mathbf{d} \leq \mathbf{e}\circ\mathbf{d} \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \overline{\mathbf{d}} \leq \mathbf{e}.$$

(11.4) As $<^{\mathbf{d}_+} \circ \leq^{\underline{\mathbf{d}}_+} \subseteq <^{\mathbf{d}_+}$, $\leq^{\underline{\mathbf{d}}_+} \subseteq \underline{<^{\mathbf{d}_+}}$. Conversely, say $(x,r)\underline{<^{\mathbf{d}_+}}(y,s)$ but $(x,r) \not\leq^{\underline{\mathbf{d}}_+} (y,s)$ so $x\underline{\mathbf{d}}y > r - s$. If $r \geq s$ then we have $z \in X$ with $z\mathbf{d}y - z\mathbf{d}x > r - s$ and hence $t - z\mathbf{d}x > r - s$, for some $t < z\mathbf{d}y$. Thus $(z, t+s) <^{\mathbf{d}_+} (x,r)$ even though $(z,t+s) \not<^{\mathbf{d}_+} (y,s)$, a contradiction. On the other hand, if $r < s$ and $\mathbf{0}\circ\mathbf{d} = \mathbf{0}$ then we have $z \in X$ with $z\mathbf{d}x < s - r$ so $(z,s) <^{\mathbf{d}_+} (x,r)$ even though $(z,s) \not<^{\mathbf{d}_+} (y,s)$, again a contradiction.

(11.5) Assume X is $<^{\mathbf{d}_+}$-continuous and $\underline{<^{\mathbf{d}_+}} = \leq^{\mathbf{e}}$. So if $x \in X$, we have $<^{\mathbf{d}_+}$-directed $Y \subseteq X_+$ such that $(x,0) = <^{\mathbf{d}_+}\text{-}\max Y$. We claim $\epsilon = \inf_{(y,r)\in Y} r$ is 0. If not, $Z = \{(y, r-\epsilon) : (y,r) \in Y\}$ is also $<^{\mathbf{d}_+}$-directed and hence $<^{\mathbf{d}_+}$-completeness yields $(z,s) = <^{\mathbf{d}_+}\text{-}\max Z$. In particular, for all $(y,r) \in Y$, $(y, r-\epsilon) <^{\mathbf{d}_+} (z,s)$ and hence $(y,r) <^{\mathbf{d}_+} (z, s+\epsilon)$. As $\mathbf{d}$ is a distance, $<^{\mathbf{d}_+}$ is transitive so this means $(x,0)\underline{<^{\mathbf{d}_+}}(z, s+\epsilon)$ and hence $(x,0) \leq^{\mathbf{e}} (z, s+\epsilon)$, i.e. $0 \leq x\mathbf{d}z \leq -s - \epsilon < 0$, a contradiction. This proves the claim so, for any $r > 0$, we have $(y,r) \in Y$ and hence $(y,r) <^{\mathbf{d}_+} (x,0)$, i.e. $y\mathbf{d}x < r$ so $\mathbf{0}\circ\mathbf{d} = \mathbf{0}$. □

What sets $\mathbf{d}_+$ apart from arbitrary distances is interpolation. In particular, we have the interpolation properties required in (6.9), (6.10) and Theorem 7.3.

Proposition 11.5. *We have $=_+ \circ <^{\mathbf{d}_+}\mathcal{P} = \mathbf{d}_+\mathcal{P}$ and $<^{=_+} \circ <^{\mathbf{d}_+} = <^{\mathbf{d}_+}$ so*

$$\overline{\mathbf{d}_+} \circ <^{\mathbf{d}_+} \ \leq \mathbf{d}_+. \tag{11.6}$$

$$\underline{\mathbf{d}_+} \circ \leq^{\mathbf{d}_+\mathcal{P}} \leq \mathbf{d}_+\mathcal{P}. \tag{11.7}$$

$$<^{\overline{\mathbf{d}_+}} \circ \leq^{\mathbf{d}_+} \ \supseteq <^{\mathbf{d}_+}. \tag{11.8}$$

Proof. For any $Y \subseteq X_+$,

$$\begin{aligned}(x,r)(=_+ \circ <_+^{\mathbf{d}}\mathcal{P})Y &= \inf\{(x,r)=_+(x,t) : \forall (y,s)\in Y\ (x,t) <^{\mathbf{d}_+} (y,s)\}\\ &= \inf\{(t-r)_+ : \sup_{(y,s)\in Y}(x\mathbf{d}y+s) < t\}\\ &= \sup_{(y,s)\in Y}(x\mathbf{d}y+s-r)_+\\ &= \sup_{(y,s)\in Y}(x,r)\mathbf{d}_+(y,s)\\ &= (x,r)(\mathbf{d}_+\mathcal{P})Y.\end{aligned}$$

Thus $=_+ \circ <^{\mathbf{d}_+}\mathcal{P} = \mathbf{d}_+\mathcal{P}$ and then Proposition 11.2 yields

(11.6) $\qquad (\overline{\mathbf{d}_+} \circ <^{\mathbf{d}_+}) = (\overline{\mathbf{d}}_+ \circ <^{\mathbf{d}_+}) \leq (=_+ \circ <^{\mathbf{d}_+}) \leq \mathbf{d}_+.$

(11.7) $\qquad (\underline{\mathbf{d}_+} \circ \leq^{\mathbf{d}_+\mathcal{P}}) = (\underline{\mathbf{d}}_+ \circ \leq^{\mathbf{d}_+}\mathcal{P}) \leq (=_+ \circ <^{\mathbf{d}_+}\mathcal{P}) \leq \mathbf{d}_+\mathcal{P}.$

If $(x,r) <^{\mathbf{d}_+} (y,s)$ then $x\mathbf{d}y < r-s$ so, taking $t \in (x\mathbf{d}y+s, r)$,

$$(x,r) <^{=_+} (x,t) <^{\mathbf{d}_+} (y,s).$$

Thus $<^{\mathbf{d}_+} = <^{=_+} \circ <^{\mathbf{d}_+}$. As $<^{=_+} \subseteq <^{\overline{\mathbf{d}_+}}$ and $<^{\mathbf{d}_+} \subseteq \leq^{\mathbf{d}_+}$, this yields (11.8). □

Theorem 11.6.

(11.9) $\qquad X$ *is* $\mathbf{d}_\circ^\bullet$*-complete* $\quad\Leftrightarrow\quad$ X_+ *is* $<^{\mathbf{d}_+}$-max*-complete.*

(11.10) $\quad X$ *is* $\mathbf{d}_\circ^\bullet$*-continuous* $\quad\Leftrightarrow\quad$ X_+ *is* $<^{\mathbf{d}_+}$-max*-continuous and* $\mathbf{0}\circ\mathbf{d} = \mathbf{0}$.

Proof.

(11.9) Assume X_+ is $<^{\mathbf{d}_+}$-max-complete. For any $\mathbf{d}$-Cauchy $(x_\lambda) \subseteq X$, define

(11.11) $$I = \{(y,r) : y\mathbf{d}(x_\lambda) < r\}.$$

If $(y,r),(z,s) \in I$ then we can take positive $t < (r - y\mathbf{d}(x_\lambda)), (s - z\mathbf{d}(x_\lambda))$. Then $y\mathbf{d}(x_\lambda) < r-t$ and $z\mathbf{d}(x_\lambda) < s-t$ so, for sufficiently large λ, $(y,r),(z,s) <^{\mathbf{d}_+} (x_\lambda, t) \in I$, (x_λ) is $\mathbf{d}$-Cauchy, i.e. I is a $<^{\mathbf{d}_+}$-ideal with $\inf_{(y,r)\in I} r = 0$. As X_+ is $<^{\mathbf{d}_+}$-max-complete, I has a $<^{\mathbf{d}_+}$-maximum $(x,0)$, which is also a $\mathbf{d}_+$-maximum by (6.9) and (11.6). Thus

$$\begin{aligned}z\mathbf{d}x &= (z,0)\mathbf{d}_+(x,0) = (z,0)\mathbf{d}_+ I = (z,0)\overline{\mathbf{d}_+}I = (z,0)\overline{\mathbf{d}}_+ I\\ &\leq \inf_{(z,r)\in I}(z,0)\overline{\mathbf{d}}_+(z,r) = \inf_{(z,r)\in I} r = z\mathbf{d}(x_\lambda)\\ &\leq \inf_{y\in X} z\mathbf{d}y + y\mathbf{d}(x_\lambda) = \inf_{y\mathbf{d}(x_\lambda)<r} z\mathbf{d}y + r\\ &= (z,0)\mathbf{d}_+ I = (z,0)\mathbf{d}_+(x,0) = z\mathbf{d}x,\end{aligned}$$

i.e. $z\mathbf{d}x = z\mathbf{d}(x_\lambda)$ so $x_\lambda \overset{\bullet}{\underset{\circ}{\to}} x$ and hence X is $\mathbf{d}_\circ^\bullet$-complete.

Now assume X is $\mathbf{d}_\circ^\bullet$-complete. Any $<^{\mathbf{d}_+}$-directed $I \subseteq X_+$ yields a net

$$(x_{(x,r)})_{(x,r)\in I}.$$

By replacing each $(y,s) \in I$ with $(y, s - \inf_{(x,r)\in I} r)$ if necessary, we may assume $\inf_{(x,r)\in I} r = 0$. If $(y,s) <^{\mathbf{d}_+} (x,r)$ then $y\mathbf{d}x < s - r \leq s$ so $(x_{(x,r)})_{(x,r)\in I}$ is $\mathbf{d}$-Cauchy and $y\mathbf{d}(x_{(x,r)}) \leq s$, for any $(y,s) \in I$. Thus we have $z \in X$ with $x_{(x,r)\in I} \overset{\bullet}{\underset{\circ}{\to}} z$ and hence, for any $(y,s) \in I$, $y\mathbf{d}z \leq s$ so $(y,s) \leq^{\mathbf{d}_+} (z,0)$. But for every $(y,s) \in I$, we have $(x,r) \in I$ with $(y,s) <^{\mathbf{d}_+} (x,r) \leq^{\mathbf{d}_+} (z,0)$ so $(y,s) <^{(\mathbf{d}\circ\mathbf{d})_+} (z,0)$, by Proposition 11.4, and hence $(y,s) <^{\mathbf{d}_+} (z,0)$, as $\mathbf{d}$ is a distance, i.e. $I <^{\mathbf{d}_+} (z,0)$. On

the other hand, if $(y,s) <^{\mathbf{d}_+} (z,0)$ then $y\mathbf{d}(x_{(x,r)}) = y\mathbf{d}z < s$, so we have $(x,r) \in I$ with $r < \frac{1}{2}(s - y\mathbf{d}z)$ and $y\mathbf{d}x < \frac{1}{2}(s + y\mathbf{d}z) < s - r$, i.e. $(y,s) <^{\mathbf{d}_+} (x,r)$. Thus $(z,0) = <^{\mathbf{d}_+}\text{-}\max I$ so X_+ is $<^{\mathbf{d}_+}$-max-complete.

(11.9) Alternative proof: First we claim that

$$X \text{ is } \mathbf{d}^\bullet_\circ\text{-complete} \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad X_+ \text{ is } \mathbf{d}_+{}^\bullet_\circ\text{-complete}.$$

For assume that X is $\mathbf{d}^\bullet_\circ$-complete and take $\mathbf{d}_+$-Cauchy (x_λ, r_λ). In particular (r_λ) is $\mathbf{q}^{\mathrm{op}}$-Cauchy (where $r\mathbf{q}s = (r-s)_+$) and bounded below by 0, and hence $r_\lambda \to r$, for some $r \in [0,\infty)$. This implies that (x_λ) is also $\mathbf{d}$-Cauchy and hence $x_\lambda \overset{\bullet}{\circ}\!\!\to x$, for some $x \in X$. Thus $(x_\lambda, r_\lambda) \overset{\bullet}{\circ}\!\!\to (x,r)$ so X_+ is $\mathbf{d}_+{}^\bullet_\circ$-complete. Conversely, if X_+ is $\mathbf{d}_+{}^\bullet_\circ$-complete then any $\mathbf{d}$-Cauchy (x_λ) yields $\mathbf{d}_+$-Cauchy $(x_\lambda, 0) \overset{\bullet}{\circ}\!\!\to (x,0)$ and hence $x_\lambda \overset{\bullet}{\circ}\!\!\to x$, i.e. X is $\mathbf{d}^\bullet_\circ$-complete.

Thus the claim is proved, and we next claim that

$$X_+ \text{ is } \mathbf{d}_+{}^\bullet_\circ\text{-complete} \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad X_+ \text{ is } <^{\mathbf{d}_+}\text{-max-complete}.$$

Indeed, if X_+ is $\mathbf{d}_+{}^\bullet_\circ$-complete then X_+ is $\mathbf{d}_+$-max-complete, by (7.2). In particular, any $<^{\mathbf{d}_+}$-directed $Y \subseteq X_+$ has a $\mathbf{d}_+$-maximum, which is also a $<^{\mathbf{d}_+}$-maximum, by (6.10) and (11.8), i.e. X_+ is $<^{\mathbf{d}_+}$-max-complete. Conversely, if X_+ is $<^{\mathbf{d}_+}$-complete then any $<^{\mathbf{d}_+}$-directed $Y \subseteq X_+$ has a $<^{\mathbf{d}_+}$-maximum, which is also a $\mathbf{d}_+$-maximum, by (6.9) and (11.6). Thus X_+ is $<^{\mathbf{d}_+}$-$\mathbf{d}_+$-max-complete and hence $\mathbf{d}_+{}^\bullet_\circ$-complete, by (7.4) and (11.7).

(11.10) Assume X is $\mathbf{d}^\bullet_\circ$-continuous. So for each $x \in X$, we have $\mathbf{d}$-Cauchy (x_λ) with $x_\lambda \overset{\circ}{\bullet}\!\!\to x$ and hence $x_\lambda \mathbf{d} x \to 0$, i.e. $\mathbf{0} \circ \mathbf{d} = \mathbf{0}$. Now take $F \in \mathcal{F}(X_+)$ with $(x,r) <^{\mathbf{d}_+} (y,s)$, for all $(x,r) \in F$. Thus we have $\epsilon > 0$ with $x\mathbf{d}y < r - s - \epsilon$, for all $(x,r) \in F$. We then have $z \in X$ with $z\mathbf{d}y < \frac{1}{2}\epsilon$ and, for all $(x,r) \in F$, $x\mathbf{d}z < x\mathbf{d}y + \frac{1}{2}\epsilon < r - s - \frac{1}{2}\epsilon$ and hence $(x,r) <^{\mathbf{d}_+} (z, s + \frac{1}{2}\epsilon) <^{\mathbf{d}_+} (y,s)$, i.e. X_+ is $<^{\mathbf{d}_+}$-continuous.

Now assume $\mathbf{0} \circ \mathbf{d} = \mathbf{0}$ and X_+ is $<^{\mathbf{d}_+}$-max-continuous. Take $F \in \mathcal{F}(X)$, $y \in X$ and $\epsilon > 0$. As $\mathbf{0} \circ \mathbf{d} = \mathbf{0}$, we may enlarge F if necessary and assume $w\mathbf{d}y < \epsilon$, for some $w \in F$. For all $x \in F$, $(x, x\mathbf{d}y + \epsilon) <^{\mathbf{d}_+} (y,0)$ so $<^{\mathbf{d}_+}$-max-continuity yields $(z,r) \in X_+$ such that, for all $x \in F$, $(x, x\mathbf{d}y + \epsilon) <^{\mathbf{d}_+} (z,r) <^{\mathbf{d}_+} (y,0)$, i.e. $x\mathbf{d}z < x\mathbf{d}y + \epsilon - r$ and $z\mathbf{d}y < r$. In particular, $0 \leq w\mathbf{d}z < w\mathbf{d}y + \epsilon - r \leq 2\epsilon - r$ so $z\mathbf{d}y < r < 2\epsilon$ and $\max_{x\in F} x\mathbf{d}z < \max_{x\in F} x\mathbf{d}y + \epsilon$, i.e. $\mathcal{F}\mathbf{d} \circ \Phi^{\mathbf{d}} \leq \mathcal{F}\mathbf{d}$ so X is $\mathbf{d}^\bullet_\circ$-continuous.

(11.10) Alternative proof: First we claim that

$$X \text{ is } \mathbf{d}^\bullet_\circ\text{-continuous} \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad X_+ \text{ is } \mathbf{d}_+{}^\bullet_\circ\text{-continuous and } \mathbf{0} \circ \mathbf{d} = \mathbf{0}. \tag{11.12}$$

For assume X is $\mathbf{d}^\bullet_\circ$-continuous so, in particular, $\mathbf{0} \circ \mathbf{d} = \mathbf{0}$. Also, for any $(x,r) \in X_+$, we have $\mathbf{d}$-Cauchy $(x_\lambda) \subseteq X$ with $x_\lambda \overset{\bullet}{\circ}\!\!\to x$, which yields $\mathbf{d}_+$-Cauchy $(x_\lambda, r) \overset{\bullet}{\circ}\!\!\to (x,r)$, i.e. X_+ is $\mathbf{d}_+{}^\bullet_\circ$-continuous. Conversely, assume X_+ is $\mathbf{d}_+{}^\bullet_\circ$-continuous and $\mathbf{0} \circ \mathbf{d} = \mathbf{0}$. Thus, for any $x \in X$, we have $\mathbf{d}_+$-Cauchy $(x_\lambda, r_\lambda) \overset{\bullet}{\circ}\!\!\to (x,0)$ and, for any $\epsilon > 0$, we have $y \in X$ with $y\mathbf{d}x < \epsilon$ and hence

$$\lim_\lambda r_\lambda \leq \lim_\lambda (y,0)\mathbf{d}_+(x_\lambda, r_\lambda) = (y,0)\mathbf{d}_+(x,0) = y\mathbf{d}x < \epsilon.$$

Thus $r_\lambda \to 0$ and hence $x_\lambda \overset{\bullet}{\circ}\!\!\to x$, i.e. X is $\mathbf{d}^\bullet_\circ$-continuous.

Thus the claim is proved, and we next claim that

$$X_+ \text{ is } \mathbf{d}_+{}^\bullet_\circ\text{-continuous} \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad X_+ \text{ is } <^{\mathbf{d}_+}\text{-max-continuous}.$$

Indeed, if X_+ is $\mathbf{d}_+{}^{\bullet}_{\circ}$-continuous then X_+ is $<^{\mathbf{d}_+}$-$\mathbf{d}_+$-max-continuous, by Corollary 8.5 (1) and (11.7), and hence $<^{\mathbf{d}_+}$-max-continuous, by (6.10) and (11.8). Conversely, if X_+ is $<^{\mathbf{d}_+}$-max-continuous then X_+ is $\mathbf{d}_+$-max-continuous, by (6.9) and (11.6), and hence $\mathbf{d}_+{}^{\bullet}_{\circ}$-continuous, by (8.1). □

Corollary 11.7 (Kostanek and Waszkiewicz 2011, Theorem 9.1)**.**

X is a $\mathbf{d}^{\bullet}_{\circ}$-domain with $\mathbf{e} = \underline{\mathbf{d}}$ $\Leftrightarrow$ X_+ is a $<^{\mathbf{d}_+}$-max-domain with $\leq^{\mathbf{e}_+} = \underline{\leq^{\mathbf{d}_+}}$.

Proof. If X is a $\mathbf{d}^{\bullet}_{\circ}$-domain with $\mathbf{e} = \underline{\mathbf{d}}$ then $\underline{\leq^{\mathbf{d}_+}} = \leq^{\mathbf{e}_+} \subseteq \overline{<^{\mathbf{d}_+}}$, by (11.3) and (11.4). Thus X_+ is a $<^{\mathbf{d}_+}$-max-domain, by Theorem 11.6. Conversely, if X_+ is a $<^{\mathbf{d}_+}$-max-domain and $\leq^{\mathbf{e}_+} = \underline{\leq^{\mathbf{d}_+}} (\subseteq \overline{<^{\mathbf{d}_+}})$ then $\mathbf{0} \circ \mathbf{d} = \mathbf{0}$, by (11.5), so $\leq^{\mathbf{e}_+} = \leq^{\underline{\mathbf{d}}_+}$, by (11.4), and hence $\overline{\mathbf{d}} \leq \mathbf{e} = \underline{\mathbf{d}}$, by Proposition 11.3 and (11.3). Thus X is a $\mathbf{d}^{\bullet}_{\circ}$-domain, again by Theorem 11.6. □

The above is dual to the original version of (Kostanek and Waszkiewicz 2011, Theorem 9.1). This has the advantage of implying the Romaguera-Valero theorem.

Corollary 11.8 (Romaguera and Valero 2010, Theorem 3.2)**.** *For hemimetric $\mathbf{d}$,*

$$X \text{ is Smyth complete} \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad X_+ \text{ is a } <^{\mathbf{d}_+}\text{-max-domain.} \tag{11.13}$$

Proof. As $\mathbf{d}$ is a hemimetric, X is trivially a $\mathbf{d}^{\bullet}_{\circ}$-predomain. In particular, $\mathbf{0} \circ \mathbf{d} = \mathbf{0}$ so $\underline{\leq^{\mathbf{d}_+}} = \leq^{\mathbf{d}_+}$, by (11.4). Thus Corollary 11.7 reduces to Corollary 11.8. □

The $<^{\mathbf{d}_+}$-max-domain part above is, however, a bit misleading, as it is really just $<^{\mathbf{d}_+}$-max-completeness that is important, as seen in (11.9).

As in (Goubault-Larrecq 2013, Definition 7.5.2), define the *aperture* of $Y \subseteq X_+$:

$$\alpha(Y) = \inf_{(x,r)\in Y} r.$$

Also denote the subsets of X_+ with zero aperture by

$$\mathcal{P}_0(X) = \{Y \in \mathcal{P}^{\mathbf{d}_+}(X_+) : \alpha(Y) = 0\}.$$
$$\mathcal{P}^{\mathbf{d}}_0(X) = \{Y \in \mathcal{P}^{\mathbf{d}_+}(X_+) : \alpha(Y) = 0\}.$$
$$\mathcal{I}^{\mathbf{d}}_0(X) = \{Y \in \mathcal{I}^{\mathbf{d}_+}(X_+) : \alpha(Y) = 0\}.$$

Theorem 11.9. *If X is $\mathbf{d}^{\bullet}_{\circ}$-continuous then*

$$\underline{\mathbf{d}^{\mathcal{H}}_+|_{\mathcal{P}^{\mathbf{d}}_0(X)}} \;=\; \mathbf{d}_+{}_{\mathcal{H}}|_{\mathcal{P}^{\mathbf{d}}_0(X)}. \tag{11.14}$$

Moreover, $\mathcal{P}^{\mathbf{d}}_0(X)$ is a $\mathbf{d}^{\mathcal{H}}_+{}^{\bullet}_{\circ}$-domain with $\mathbf{d}^{\mathcal{H}}_+{}^{\bullet}_{\circ}$-basis $\{(\leq^{\mathbf{d}_+}(x,0)) : x \in X\}$ and

$$(\leq^{\mathbf{d}_+}(x,0))\mathbf{d}^{\mathcal{H}}_+(\leq^{\mathbf{d}_+}(y,0)) \;\leq\; x\mathbf{d}y. \tag{11.15}$$

Proof. As X is $\mathbf{d}^{\bullet}_{\circ}$-continuous, X_+ is $\mathbf{d}_+{}^{\bullet}_{\circ}$-continuous, by (11.12), and hence $\mathbf{d}_+$-max-continuous, by Corollary 8.5 (1) and (11.7). In particular, $(\leq^{\mathbf{d}_+}(x,0))$ is $\mathbf{d}_+$-directed and also has zero aperture, as $\mathbf{0} \circ \mathbf{d} = \mathbf{0}$, so $(\leq^{\mathbf{d}_+}(x,0)) \in \mathcal{P}^{\mathbf{d}}_0(X)$.

For $\mathbf{d}^{\mathcal{H}}_+$-continuity, take $W \in \mathcal{P}^{\mathbf{d}}_0(X)$ and $Y, Z \subseteq X_+$. For $r > Y\mathbf{d}^{\mathcal{H}}_+W, Z\mathbf{d}^{\mathcal{H}}_+W$, we have $(u,s),(v,t) \in W$ with $Y\mathbf{d}_+(u,s), Z\mathbf{d}_+(v,t) < r$. As $\alpha(W) = 0$, for any $\epsilon > 0$, we have $(x,\epsilon') \in W$, for some $\epsilon \in (0,\epsilon)$. As W is $\mathbf{d}$-directed, we have $(w,\delta) \in W$ with $\{(u,s),(v,t),(x,\epsilon')\}\mathbf{d}_+(w,\delta) < \epsilon - \epsilon'$ so, setting $W_0 = (\leq^{\mathbf{d}_+}(w,0))$,

$$W_0\mathbf{d}^{\mathcal{H}}_+W \leq W_0\mathbf{d}^{\mathcal{H}}_+(w,\delta) \leq \delta < \epsilon.$$

Also $(u,s)\mathbf{d}_+W_0 = (u,s)\mathbf{d}_+(w,0) \leq (u,s)\mathbf{d}_+(w,\delta) < \epsilon$, by $\mathbf{d}_+{}^{\bullet}_{\circ}$-continuity, so $Y\mathbf{d}_+^{\mathcal{H}}W_0 < r+\epsilon$ and, likewise, $Z\mathbf{d}_+^{\mathcal{H}}W_0 < r+\epsilon$. Thus, as r and ϵ were arbitrary,

$$\mathcal{F}\mathbf{d}_+^{\mathcal{H}} \circ \{(\leq^{\mathbf{d}_+}(x,0)) : x \in X\} \circ \Phi^{\mathbf{d}_+^{\mathcal{H}}} \leq \mathcal{F}\mathbf{d}_+^{\mathcal{H}},$$

i.e. $\mathcal{P}_0^{\mathbf{d}}(X)$ is a $\mathbf{d}_+^{\mathcal{H}\bullet}_{\circ}$-continuous with $\mathbf{d}_+^{\mathcal{H}\bullet}_{\circ}$-basis $\{(\leq^{\mathbf{d}_+}(x,0)) : x \in X\}$.[3]

As $\mathbf{d}_+ \leq \mathbf{d}_+ \circ \underline{\mathbf{d}_+} = \mathbf{d}_+ \circ \underline{\mathbf{d}}_+$, (10.3) yields $\mathbf{d}_+^{\mathcal{H}} \leq \mathbf{d}_+^{\mathcal{H}} \circ \underline{\mathbf{d}}_{+\mathcal{H}}$ and hence

$$\underline{\mathbf{d}_+^{\mathcal{H}}} \leq \underline{\mathbf{d}}_{+\mathcal{H}}. \tag{11.16}$$

For $Y \subseteq X_+$ let $Y^r = \{(y,s+r) : (y,s) \in Y\}$ so $Y\underline{\mathbf{d}_+^{\mathcal{H}}}Y^r \leq Y\underline{\mathbf{d}}_{+\mathcal{H}}Y^r < r$ and, whenever $Y\mathbf{d}_+^{\mathcal{H}}Z < r$, we have $Y \leq^{\mathbf{d}_+^{\mathcal{H}}} Z$. This shows that

$$\underline{\mathbf{d}_+^{\mathcal{H}}} \circ \leq^{\mathbf{d}_+^{\mathcal{H}}\mathcal{P}} \;\leq\; \mathbf{d}_+^{\mathcal{H}}\mathcal{P}.$$

By Theorem 10.5, $\mathcal{P}^{\mathbf{d}_+}(X_+)$ is $\mathbf{d}_+^{\mathcal{H}}$-max-complete and hence $\mathbf{d}_+^{\mathcal{H}\bullet}_{\circ}$-complete, by (7.4). Now note that $\alpha(Y) = X_+\mathbf{0}_{+\mathcal{H}}Y$ so, as $\mathbf{0}_{+\mathcal{H}}$ is a distance with $\mathbf{0}_{+\mathcal{H}} \leq \mathbf{d}_{+\mathcal{H}}$,

$$\alpha(Y) \leq \alpha(Z) + Z\mathbf{d}_{+\mathcal{H}}Y \leq \alpha(Z) + Z\mathbf{d}_+^{\mathcal{H}}Y. \tag{11.17}$$

This means any $\mathbf{d}_+^{\mathcal{H}}{}_{\circ}$-limit of a $\mathbf{d}_+^{\mathcal{H}}$-Cauchy net in $\mathcal{P}_0^{\mathbf{d}}(X)$ also has zero aperture. Thus $\mathcal{P}_0^{\mathbf{d}}(X)$ is also $\mathbf{d}_+^{\mathcal{H}\bullet}_{\circ}$-complete.

(11.14) As X_+ is $\mathbf{d}_+$-max-continuous, (5.2) and (6.4) yield

$$\begin{aligned}
Y\mathbf{d}_{+\mathcal{H}}Z &= \sup_{(y,s)\in Y}\inf_{(z,t)\in Z}(y,s)\mathbf{d}(z,t)\\
&= \sup_{(y,s)\in Y}\inf_{(z,t)\in Z}(y\mathbf{d}z - s + t)_+\\
&= \sup_{(y,s)\in Y}\inf_{(z,t)\in Z}((y,0)\mathbf{d}(z,t) - (y,0)\underline{\mathbf{d}}(y,s))_+\\
&= \sup_{(y,s)\in Y}\inf_{(z,t)\in Z}((\leq^{\mathbf{d}_+}(y,0))\mathbf{d}(z,t) - (\leq^{\mathbf{d}_+}(y,0))\mathbf{d}(y,s))_+\\
&= ((\leq^{\mathbf{d}_+}(y,0))\mathbf{d}_+^{\mathcal{H}}Z - (\leq^{\mathbf{d}_+}(y,0))\mathbf{d}_+^{\mathcal{H}}Y)_+
\end{aligned}$$

As $(\leq^{\mathbf{d}_+}(y,0)) \in \mathcal{P}_0^{\mathbf{d}}(X)$, this and (11.16) yields

$$\mathbf{d}_{+\mathcal{H}}|_{\mathcal{P}_0^{\mathbf{d}}(X)} \leq \underline{\mathbf{d}_+^{\mathcal{H}}|_{\mathcal{P}_0^{\mathbf{d}}(X)}} \leq \underline{\mathbf{d}_+^{\mathcal{H}}}|_{\mathcal{P}_0^{\mathbf{d}}(X)} \leq \underline{\mathbf{d}}_{+\mathcal{H}}|_{\mathcal{P}_0^{\mathbf{d}}(X)} \leq \mathbf{d}_{+\mathcal{H}}|_{\mathcal{P}_0^{\mathbf{d}}(X)}.$$

By (10.3), $\mathbf{d}_+^{\mathcal{H}} \leq \mathbf{d}_{+\mathcal{H}} \circ \mathbf{d}_+^{\mathcal{H}}$ so $\overline{\mathbf{d}_+^{\mathcal{H}}} \leq \mathbf{d}_{+\mathcal{H}}$ and hence, by (10.5),

$$\overline{\mathbf{d}_+^{\mathcal{H}}|_{\mathcal{P}_0^{\mathbf{d}}(X)}} \leq \overline{\mathbf{d}_+^{\mathcal{H}}}|_{\mathcal{P}_0^{\mathbf{d}}(X)} \leq \mathbf{d}_{+\mathcal{H}}|_{\mathcal{P}_0^{\mathbf{d}}(X)} = \underline{\mathbf{d}_+^{\mathcal{H}}|_{\mathcal{P}_0^{\mathbf{d}}(X)}}.$$

Thus $\mathcal{P}_0^{\mathbf{d}}(X)$ is a $\mathbf{d}_+^{\mathcal{H}}$-max-domain. Lastly, for (11.15), note that (10.6) yields

$$(\leq^{\mathbf{d}_+}(x,0))\mathbf{d}_+^{\mathcal{H}}(\leq^{\mathbf{d}_+}(y,0)) \;\leq\; (x,0)\mathbf{d}_+(y,0) = x\mathbf{d}y. \qquad \square$$

Corollary 11.10. *The following are equivalent.*

1. *X is a $\mathbf{d}^{\bullet}_{\circ}$-predomain.*
2. *X is a $\mathbf{d}'^{\bullet}_{\circ}$-basis of a $\mathbf{d}'^{\bullet}_{\circ}$-domain $X' \supseteq X$ with $\mathbf{d}'|_X = \mathbf{d}$.*

Proof.

[3] Alternatively one could argue that, for any $Y \in \mathcal{P}_0^{\mathbf{d}}(X)$ with ($<^{\mathbf{d}}$-directed) $\mathbf{d}_+^{\mathcal{H}}{}_{\bullet}$-interior Z, $(\leq^{\mathbf{d}_+}(x,0))_{(x,r)\in Z}$ is a $\mathbf{d}_+^{\mathcal{H}}$-Cauchy net with $\mathbf{d}_+^{\mathcal{H}\bullet}_{\circ}$-limit Y.

(1)⇒(2) Assume (1) and let X' be the (disjoint) union of X and $\mathcal{P}_0^{\mathbf{d}}(X)$. Extend $\mathbf{d}_+^{\mathcal{H}}$ to $\mathbf{d}'$ on X' by making each $x \in X$ $\mathbf{d}'$-equivalent to $(\leq^{\mathbf{d}_+}(x,0))$. By Theorem 11.9, the only thing left to show is that the inequality in (11.15) is an equality. But $\overline{\mathbf{d}} \leq \underline{\mathbf{d}}$ implies $\overline{\mathbf{d}_+} = \overline{\mathbf{d}}_+ \leq \underline{\mathbf{d}}_+ = \underline{\mathbf{d}_+}$ so, by (10.7),

$$(\leq^{\mathbf{d}_+}(x,0))\mathbf{d}_+^{\mathcal{H}}(\leq^{\mathbf{d}_+}(y,0)) \geq (x,0)\mathbf{d}_+(y,0) = x\mathbf{d}y.$$

(2)⇒(1) If $X \subseteq X'$ is a $\mathbf{d}'^{\bullet}_{\circ}$-basis and $\mathbf{d} = \mathbf{d}'|_X$ then X is certainly $\mathbf{d}^{\bullet}_{\circ}$-continuous. If X' is also a $\mathbf{d}'^{\bullet}_{\circ}$-(pre)domain then $\overline{\mathbf{d}} = \overline{\mathbf{d}'}|_X \leq \underline{\mathbf{d}'}|_X = \underline{\mathbf{d}}$, by Proposition 8.8, i.e. X is a $\mathbf{d}^{\bullet}_{\circ}$-predomain. □

In particular, any hemimetric space $(X, \mathbf{d})$ has a completion $(X', \mathbf{d}')$, but there is no guarantee that $\mathbf{d}'$ will also be a hemimetric, i.e. $\leq^{\mathbf{d}'}$ may not be reflexive on the larger space X'. So in this case $(X', \mathbf{d}')$ is not a Smyth completion of X in the usual sense. On the other hand, $\mathbf{d}_{+\mathcal{H}}$ is always a hemimetric on $\mathcal{P}_0^{\mathbf{d}}(X)$, which is $\mathbf{d}_{+\mathcal{H}}{}^{\circ}_{\circ}$-complete by Theorem 9.3 and Theorem 11.9. Indeed the hemimetric space $(\mathcal{P}_0^{\mathbf{d}}(X), \mathbf{d}_{+\mathcal{H}})$, or the equivalent quasimetric space $(\mathcal{I}_0^{\mathbf{d}}(X), \mathbf{d}_{+\mathcal{H}})$, is often called the *Yoneda completion* of the hemimetric space $(X, \mathbf{d})$. From the following we see that the Yoneda completion is the Smyth completion, whenever it exists.

Definition 11.11. *We call* $(X', \mathbf{d}')$ *a* Smyth completion *of* $(X, \mathbf{d})$ *if* $X \subseteq X'$ *is a* $\mathbf{d}'^{\bullet}_{\circ}$*-basis of* $\mathbf{d}'^{\bullet}_{\circ}$*-complete* X' *and* $\mathbf{d}'$ *is a hemimetric extending* $\mathbf{d}$.

Theorem 11.12. *If* $\mathbf{d}$ *is a hemimetric, the following are equivalent.*

(1) $(X, \mathbf{d})$ *has a Smyth completion.*
(2) $(\mathcal{P}_0^{\mathbf{d}}(X), \mathbf{d}_{+\mathcal{H}})$ *is Smyth complete.*
(3) $(\mathcal{P}_0^{\mathbf{d}}(X), \mathbf{d}_+^{\mathcal{H}})$ *is a hemimetric space.*
(4) Every $\mathbf{d}$*-Cauchy net in* X *is* $\mathbf{d}^{\mathrm{op}}$*-Cauchy.*
(5) Every $\mathbf{d}$*-Cauchy sequence in* X *is* $\mathbf{d}^{\mathrm{op}}$*-Cauchy.*

Proof.

(1)⇒(4) We show that any $\mathbf{d}$-pre-Cauchy (x_λ) in a Smyth complete hemimetric space $(X, \mathbf{d})$ is $\mathbf{d}^{\mathrm{op}}$-Cauchy. Indeed Smyth completeness yields $x = \mathbf{d}^{\bullet}_{\circ}\text{-}\lim x_\lambda$ and then $\underline{\mathbf{d}} = \mathbf{d}$ and (4.9) yields

$$\lim_\gamma \lim_\delta x_\delta \mathbf{d} x_\gamma = \lim_\gamma x\mathbf{d}x_\gamma = x\mathbf{d}x = 0,$$

i.e. (x_λ) is $\mathbf{d}^{\mathrm{op}}$-pre-Cauchy. So (x_λ) is $\mathbf{d}^\vee$-pre-Cauchy and thus $\mathbf{d}^\vee$-Cauchy.

(4)⇔(5) See Proposition 10.4.

(4)⇒(3) If every $\mathbf{d}$-Cauchy net in X is $\mathbf{d}^{\mathrm{op}}$-Cauchy then every $\mathbf{d}_+$-Cauchy net in X_+ is $(\mathbf{d}_+)^{\mathrm{op}}$-Cauchy (as in the alternative proof of (11.9)). Thus $\mathbf{d}_+^{\mathcal{H}}$ is a hemimetric on $\mathcal{P}^{\mathbf{d}_+}(X_+)$ and hence $\mathcal{P}_0^{\mathbf{d}}(X)$, again by Proposition 10.4.

(3)⇒(2) By Theorem 11.9, $\mathcal{P}_0^{\mathbf{d}}(X)$ is $\mathbf{d}_+^{\mathcal{H}\bullet}_{\circ}$-complete. If $\mathbf{d}_+^{\mathcal{H}}$ is a hemimetric then

$$\mathbf{d}_+^{\mathcal{H}} = \underline{\mathbf{d}_+^{\mathcal{H}}} \leq \underline{\mathbf{d}}_{+\mathcal{H}} = \mathbf{d}_{+\mathcal{H}} \leq \mathbf{d}_+^{\mathcal{H}},$$

by (10.1) and (11.16), so $\mathcal{P}_0^{\mathbf{d}}(X)$ is $\mathbf{d}_{+\mathcal{H}}{}^{\bullet}_{\circ}$-complete.

(2)⇒(3) If $\mathcal{P}_0^{\mathbf{d}}(X)$ is $\mathbf{d}_{+\mathcal{H}}{}^{\bullet}_{\circ}$-complete, $\mathbf{d}_{+\mathcal{H}}|_{\mathcal{P}_0^{\mathbf{d}}(X)} = {}^{\circ}_{\circ}(\mathbf{d}_{+\mathcal{H}}|_{\mathcal{P}_0^{\mathbf{d}}(X)})$. By Theorem 11.9, $\mathcal{P}_0^{\mathbf{d}}(X)$ is a $\mathbf{d}_+^{\mathcal{H}\bullet}_{\circ}$-domain with $\underline{\mathbf{d}_+^{\mathcal{H}}|_{\mathcal{P}_0^{\mathbf{d}}(X)}} = \mathbf{d}_{+\mathcal{H}}|_{\mathcal{P}_0^{\mathbf{d}}(X)}$. So by Theorem 9.3, $\mathbf{d}_+^{\mathcal{H}}|_{\mathcal{P}_0^{\mathbf{d}}(X)} = \mathbf{d}_{+\mathcal{H}}|_{\mathcal{P}_0^{\mathbf{d}}(X)}$ is a hemimetric.

(3)⇒(1) If $\mathbf{d}_+^{\mathcal{H}}$ is a hemimetric on $\mathcal{P}_0^{\mathbf{d}}(X)$ then $(X', \mathbf{d}')$ in the proof of Corollary 11.10 (1)⇒(2) is a Smyth completion of X. □

Finally, as in Theorem 10.7, we see that $\mathbf{d}^\bullet_\circ$-completions are unique. Indeed, the following is saying that $\mathcal{I}^{\mathbf{d}}_0(B)$ is universal among $\mathbf{d}^\bullet_\circ$-predomain extensions of B, and unique among $\mathbf{d}^\bullet_\circ$-domain extensions, up to isometry (and $\mathbf{d}$-equivalence).

Theorem 11.13. *If $\mathbf{d}$ is a distance and B is a $\mathbf{d}^\bullet_\circ$-basis of $\mathbf{d}^\bullet_\circ$-predomain X,*

$$x \mapsto (\leq^{\mathbf{d}_+}(x,0)) \cap B_+ \tag{11.18}$$

is an isometry to $\mathbf{d}^{\mathcal{H}\bullet}_{+\circ}$-domain $\mathcal{I}^{\mathbf{d}}_0(B)$, which is onto iff X is a $\mathbf{d}^\bullet_\circ$-domain.

Proof. As B is a $\mathbf{d}^\bullet_\circ$-basis, $(\leq^{\mathbf{d}_+}(x,0))\cap B \in \mathcal{I}^{\mathbf{d}}_0(B)$, for all $x \in X$. Every $Y \in \mathcal{P}^{\mathbf{d}}_0(B)$ is $\mathbf{d}^{\mathcal{H}}_+$-equivalent to $\overline{Y}^{\bullet} \in \mathcal{I}^{\mathbf{d}}_0(B)$ so, by Theorem 11.9, $\mathcal{I}^{\mathbf{d}}_0(B)$ is a $\mathbf{d}^{\mathcal{H}\bullet}_{+\circ}$-domain and

$$((\leq^{\mathbf{d}_+}(x,0)) \cap B)\mathbf{d}^{\mathcal{H}}_+((\leq^{\mathbf{d}_+}(y,0)) \cap B) \;=\; x\mathbf{d}y,$$

i.e. (11.18) is an isometry. Also, like in (11.11), for any $\mathbf{d}$-Cauchy $(x_\lambda) \subseteq X$, take

$$I = \{(x,r) : x \in B \text{ and } x\mathbf{d}(x_\lambda) \leq r\},$$

so $I \in \mathcal{I}^{\mathcal{H}}_0(B)$ (and every $I \in \mathcal{I}^{\mathcal{H}}_0(B)$ is of this form). Also, as B is a $\mathbf{d}^\bullet_\circ$-basis,

$$x_\lambda \overset{\bullet}{\circ}\!\!\to x \quad\Leftrightarrow\quad (x,0) = \mathbf{d}_+\text{-max}\, I \quad\Leftrightarrow\quad \mathbf{d}_+(x,0) = \mathbf{d}I \quad\Leftrightarrow\quad (\leq^{\mathbf{d}_+}(x,0)\cap B_+) = I,$$

so (11.18) is onto iff X is $\mathbf{d}^\bullet_\circ$-complete and hence a $\mathbf{d}^\bullet_\circ$-domain. □

References

Bice, Tristan (2016). *Semicontinuity in Ordered Banach Spaces*.
EPRINT: arXiv:1604.03154.

– (2017). "Yoneda completeness".
In: *Mathematical Structures in Computer Science*, pp. 1–14.
DOI: 10.1017/S0960129517000032.

Bonsangue, M.M., F. van Breugel, and J.J.M.M. Rutten (1998).
"Generalized metric spaces: Completion, topology, and powerdomains via the Yoneda embedding". In: *Theoretical Computer Science* 193.1-2, pp. 1–51.
ISSN: 0304-3975. DOI: 10.1016/S0304-3975(97)00042-X.

Freyd, Peter J. and Andre Scedrov (1990). *Categories, allegories*. Vol. 39.
North-Holland Mathematical Library.
North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam, pp. xviii+296.
ISBN: 0-444-70368-3; 0-444-70367-5.

Gierz, G. et al. (2003). *Continuous lattices and domains*. Vol. 93.
Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications.
Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. xxxvi+591. ISBN: 0-521-80338-1.
DOI: 10.1017/CBO9780511542725.

Goubault-Larrecq, Jean (2013). *Non-Hausdorff topology and domain theory*.
Vol. 22. New Mathematical Monographs.
[On the cover: Selected topics in point-set topology].
Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. vi+491. ISBN: 978-1-107-03413-6.
DOI: 10.1017/CBO9781139524438.

Hofmann, Dirk and Paweł Waszkiewicz (2011).
"Approximation in quantale-enriched categories".
In: *Topology Appl.* 158.8, pp. 963–977. ISSN: 0166-8641.
DOI: 10.1016/j.topol.2011.02.003.

– (2012). “A duality of quantale-enriched categories”.
In: *J. Pure Appl. Algebra* 216.8-9, pp. 1866–1878. ISSN: 0022-4049.
DOI: 10.1016/j.jpaa.2012.02.024.

Keimel, Klaus (2016). *The Cuntz semigroup and domain theory.*
EPRINT: arXiv:1605.07654.

Kostanek, Mateusz and Paweł Waszkiewicz (2011).
“The formal ball model for $\mathcal{Q}$-categories”.
In: *Math. Structures Comput. Sci.* 21.1, pp. 41–64. ISSN: 0960-1295.
DOI: 10.1017/S0960129510000447.

Künzi, H. P. and M. P. Schellekens (2002).
“On the Yoneda completion of a quasi-metric space”.
In: *Theoret. Comput. Sci.* 278.1-2. Mathematical foundations of programming semantics (Boulder, CO, 1996), pp. 159–194. ISSN: 0304-3975.
DOI: 10.1016/S0304-3975(00)00335-2.

Lawvere, F. William (2002).
“Metric spaces, generalized logic, and closed categories [Rend. Sem. Mat. Fis. Milano **43** (1973), 135–166 (1974); MR0352214 (50 #4701)]”.
In: *Repr. Theory Appl. Categ.* 1. With an author commentary: Enriched categories in the logic of geometry and analysis, pp. 1–37.
URL: http://www.tac.mta.ca/tac/reprints/articles/1/tr1.pdf.

Rao, S. P. and Q. G. Li (2013). “Fuzzy Z-continuous posets”.
In: *Abstr. Appl. Anal.* Art. ID 607934, 14. ISSN: 1085-3375.
DOI: 10.1155/2013/607934.

Romaguera, Salvador and Oscar Valero (2010). “Domain theoretic characterisations of quasi-metric completeness in terms of formal balls”.
In: *Math. Structures Comput. Sci.* 20.3, pp. 453–472. ISSN: 0960-1295.
DOI: 10.1017/S0960129510000010.

Wagner, Kim Ritter (1997). “Liminf convergence in Ω-categories”.
In: *Theoret. Comput. Sci.* 184.1-2, pp. 61–104. ISSN: 0304-3975.
DOI: 10.1016/S0304-3975(96)00223-X.

Weihrauch, K. and Ulrich Schreiber (1981).
“Embedding metric spaces into cpo’s”.
In: *Theoret. Comput. Sci.* 16.1, pp. 5–24. ISSN: 0304-3975.
DOI: 10.1016/0304-3975(81)90027-X.

Institute of Mathematics of the Polish Academy of Sciences, Warsaw, Poland
E-mail address: Tristan.Bice@gmail.com